DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 647 UD 020 864

TITLE	Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Report and Recommendations for Change.
INSTITUTION	Howard Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for the Study of Educational Policy.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	70p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Howard University, 2900 Van Ness Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20008.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Education; Ancillary School Services; *Change Strategies; Educational Administration; Enrollment Trends; Ethnic Groups; Faculty; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Minority Groups; *Statistical Studies; Student Characteristics; Trustees; *Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

This report is a summary of a study about minority participation in higher education. The first section of this summary presents a series of recommendations designed to assist in making institutions of higher education better able to meet the needs of racial, ethnic, and minority groups. Following chapters present descriptive data about various aspects of two-year colleges: institutional characteristics; enrollment patterns; faculty, administrators, and trustees; and academic and supportive services. The final chapter discusses educational statistics and their influence on policy. Tables of data are included and additional data are appended. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MINORITIES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES:

A REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

ED194647

Issued by
INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY
OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Published by ISEP
Washington, D.C.
1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth S. Tollett
Inst. for Study of Ed. Policy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD020864

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Copyright ©1980, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy.

FOREWORD

The Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP) was established in 1974 with substantial support from the Ford Foundation to act as a national clearinghouse and a research center on the issues affecting equal opportunity for Blacks in higher education. Through its reports and monographs, through its seminars and workshops and through its announcements and public testimony, ISEP attempts to fill a vacuum in the organized body of knowledge on minority participation in higher education. The primary program objective of the Institute is to issue an annual or biennial report on the status and situation of Blacks in higher education. Two such reports have been published and another has been completed. These reports deal with Blacks in all aspects of postsecondary education. The National Advisory Board decided that because of the emerging special and significant place of community colleges in providing access to Blacks in higher education, a special report should be done on two-year colleges from the minority perspective.

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Report and Recommendations for Change is a revised, summary edition of a larger Institute monograph written by Dr. Michael A. Olivas, a former Senior Fellow and Assistant to the Director for Research. That monograph, entitled, *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges*, was published by Howard University Press in September, 1979.

The Dilemma of Access is the first comprehensive study by the Institute that has tried to contain not only the Black perspective, but also the perspective of other minority groups. The author, in developing its research design, urged the Institute's staff and the Board to cover more than Blacks in dealing with disadvantaged racial, ethnic, and minority groups. The Board approved this request, and the results can be seen in his study and this Report. Since this Report is a summary of the larger study, the Board only adopts its "Recommendations for Change." The Institute's Board hopes that this Report will make a constructive contribution to the ongoing inquiries and discussions of two-year and other colleges in the American educational system.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Olivas who was the principal investigator for this Report as well as *The Dilemma of Access*. The Board together with Dr. Olivas wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Nan Whiting Alimba and Sandra Davis in the preparation of this Report. Finally, Howard University and the Institute gratefully acknowledge the assistance and continued support of the Ford Foundation and its Program Officer in charge of our grant, Dr. Benjamin Payton, who has been indispensable for all works of the Institute, including this Report. Of course, the views expressed in this Report do not necessarily reflect those of the Foundation.

Kenneth S. Tollett
Chairman
National Advisory Board
Institute for the Study of
Educational Policy

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Kenneth S. Tollett, Chairman
Distinguished Professor of
Higher Education
Howard University-Dunbarton
Campus
Washington, D.C.

Elias Blake, Jr., President
Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia

James E. Cheek, President
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Lewis C. Dowdy, Chancellor
North Carolina A & T University
Greensboro, North Carolina

Edward Hawthorne, Dean
The Graduate School
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Willie T. Howard, Dean
School of Education
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Clark Kerr, Chairman
Carnegie Council on Policy
Studies in Higher Education
Berkeley, California

James R. Lawson, Director
Office of University Affairs
National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Washington, D.C.

Lionel Newsom, President
Central State University
Wilberforce, Ohio

James Perkins, Chairman
International Council for
Educational Development
New York, New York

Lois Rice, Vice President
College Entrance Examination
Board
Washington, D.C.

Norvel Smith, Associate Vice
Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of California-Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Nancy H. Teeters
Member of Board of Governors
Federal Reserve System
Washington, D.C.

Horace Traylor, Dean of
Development
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, Florida

Lorraine A. Williams, Vice
President for Academic Affairs
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Stephen Wright
1620 Queen Street
Hampton, Virginia

CONTENTS

Foreword i
Recommendations 1-18 1-7
Chapter One 8
Chapter Two 18
Chapter Three 26
Chapter Four 31
Chapter Five 37
Chapter Six 43
Appendix A 48
Appendix B 49
Appendix C 53
Appendix D 55
Appendix E 56
Selected Bibliography 57-63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 8
Table 2 9
Table 3 10
Table 4 11
Table 5 13
Table 6 14
Table 7 16
Table 8 18
Table 9 19
Table 10 21
Table 11 22
Table 12 23
Table 13 26
Table 14 27
Table 15 31
Table 16 32
Table 17 32
Table 18 33
Table 19 35
Table 20 35
Table 21 39

MINORITIES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

RECOMMENDATION #1

Congress and the Office of Education should consider the feasibility of removing the two-year college setaside from Title III and designating an authority for developing two-year institutions under Title X. This revised Title X should be reauthorized, and Congress should appropriate a sum above the amount presently set aside in Title III.

In the current reauthorization of the Higher Education Amendments, several proposals have been promoted to reduce the friction between two-year and four-year institutional competition in Title III (Strengthening Developing Institutions). The proposals most likely to assist minority students are those that incorporate increased support to two-year colleges while retaining the primary emphasis upon baccalaureate institutions that serve minority and low income students. Increased authorization and appropriations levels will be necessary, as the program has reached its $120 million ceiling. Competition between institutional types could be diminished by separate authorities for two and four-year colleges, such as with a revised Title X.

RECOMMENDATION #2

The Director of the Community College Unit, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, should be given larger responsibilities within the Bureau to coordinate federal policies towards two-year colleges.

The existing directorship is a symbolic appointment without specific, designated responsibilities to advocate for its designated constituency. Title X, the sole earmarked two-year college Title, has never been funded, and is unlikely to be funded in its present form. The Director should be given authority, by statute or regulations, to coordinate programs and setasides for two-year institutions and to provide technical assistance. The Director should regularly assess United States Office of Education (USOE) programs for their impact upon two-year colleges, and should provide drafting assistance to legislative liaison staff in order to assure two-year college eligibility for funded programs.

RECOMMENDATION #3

To increase two-year college shares of federal programs, two-year college personnel should be more extensively involved in competitive proposal reading.

Existing programs, through design or practice, tend to favor graduate or baccalaureate institutions. This is so in part because of meritocratic competition, in part because of proposal selection processes that involve senior college participants, and in part because two-year institutions have not perceived proposal writing or development activities as essential missions. The Director, with or without additional portfolio, should convene a task force to remedy this underparticipation in federal programs. Similarly, the Bureau of Student Financial Assistance should take steps to assure more active participation by two-year colleges. For instance, programs that would enable students and parents to understand and complete financial aid forms should be identified and strengthened.

The Director should monitor emerging legislation and triggered-funding programs to ensure that two-year colleges participate fully in such programs. For example, Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (1958), authorizing "Grant Programs to Promote Cultural Understanding," was triggered for funding only after $15 million had been expended for earlier sections. FY 1979's appropriations have triggered this funding mechanism, and the considerable multicultural activities conducted by two-year colleges would make them eligible for the grant programs.

RECOMMENDATION #4

The Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education should evaluate all statutes, regulations, and internal procedures to assure full and fair participation by two-year colleges and minority institutions in federal programs.

Because minorities continue to be underrepresented in decision-making levels of federal education agencies, it is essential that the work product be reviewed for its calculated or inadvertently-negative impact upon two-year colleges and minority institutions. The Liaison for Women and Minorities and the Director of the Community College Unit should work together to monitor this process.

RECOMMENDATION #5

States should systematically gather, analyze, and disseminate institutional racial and ethnic enrollment, faculty, and program data.

Throughout this book, the vagaries of existing data systems will be noted. Because states bear a major responsibility for providing equality of access and opportunity, they appear to be the major policymakers concerning racial and ethnic data. Yet an Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP) survey indicated scant attention being paid to this aspect of systemwide planning. The USOE State Commissions staff should use its 1202 planning authority to oversee and coordinate this responsibility, and to serve as technical advisers to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data gathering efforts.

RECOMMENDATION #6

States should review their two-year college financing policies to ensure equitable distribution of state tax resources.

Proposition 13, and its property tax implications, has shown the precariousness of financing higher education through local tax bases. Further, the data examined in this study have shown enormous discrepancies between public subsidies at two and four-year levels of statewide higher education systems. In each case, despite high part-time enrollments, two-year colleges received strikingly smaller per capita and full-time equivalent (FTE) appropriations. It is only a matter of time before minority groups or public interest groups mount legal challenges to this system of financing public higher education. State authorities would do well to anticipate such challenges by eliminating inequities.

RECOMMENDATION #7

States should be the major consumer advocates of higher education, making available all pertinent institutional information so that students can make informed decisions concerning their enrollment.

The increased competition for students between public and private sectors, and among institutions, affords states excellent opportunities to gather and disseminate information to assist students in choosing schools, in securing counseling, and in applying for financial assistance. The centralization of this information would reduce costs, provide planning data, and would likely reduce student attrition. Informal and formal minority information systems and community-based organizations should be utilized. To assist students in securing information and in negotiating systems is perhaps the greatest contribution statewide agencies could make to the creation of a more diverse and accessible marketplace.

RECOMMENDATION #8

States should examine existing and proposed statutes, regulations, and practices to assess disproportionate impacts upon two-year colleges and minority students.

In one midwestern state, for instance, an existing residency rule literally prevented migrant workers from enrolling as residential students in state institutions, even though existing supportive programs were intended to assist just such nontraditional students. When the issue was brought to the attention of state officials, an exemption for alternative documentation was devised and is presently in place.

State coordinating or governing boards are in strategic positions to discover and eliminate such systemic barriers to minority participation, and institutions should actively cooperate to bring administrative problems to the attention of state officials. Statewide groups of professionals (e.g., registrars and admissions officials, financial aid officers) should regularly review institutional practices for such unintended barriers and should propose creative equitable means to eliminate these barriers.

RECOMMENDATION #9

Colleges should practice aggressive affirmative action in hiring faculty and administrative personnel.

This study has documented the surprisingly low proportion of minority faculty and administrators in two-year colleges, even in colleges with substantial minority enrollments. This situation is particularly indefensible in two-year institutions, where the need for minority leadership and role models is particularly acute, where demand has been high for many years, and where the supply of qualified minorities is greater than the supply of Ph.D. holders for senior institutions. The historical exclusion of minorities from skilled trades and crafts has resulted in fewer minority faculty for technical curricula, but the striking underrepresentation of minority faculty in transfer programs is inexcusable.

RECOMMENDATION #10

Graduate and professional programs should actively seek minority students and aggressively apply for available federal funding.

Senior institutions must share the responsibility for the underrepresentation of minorities in administrative and faculty ranks, inasmuch as they serve as training institutions for such personnel. The only means for ending this cycle of exclusion is for senior institutions to cooperate with education and business sectors in identifying minority persons with the desire and capabilities to pursue graduate work. Historically denied such opportunities, many women and minorities fully capable of undertaking graduate work have never been given the encouragement or means to attend college. Majority men have historically competed only with each other for career positions. Institutions, themselves parties to these practices, must undertake extraordinary steps to end them.

RECOMMENDATION #11

Institutions must identify underserved clientele, assess their needs, and move aggressively to meet these needs.

In some cases, this recommendation means undertaking extensive sensitivity campaigns to eliminate stereotypes, as with mainstreaming handicapped students or with providing in-service training to staff who have little experience with non-traditional students. Two-year colleges have moved assertively into this area by arranging class hours and modes of instruction to accommodate new learners. Four-year institutions, in need of student enrollments, have similarly moved to market themselves more effectively.

However, providing courses at all hours and teaching courses by newspaper will not adequately reach a major non-traditional clientele already enrolled in institutions: full-time minority students, disproportionately enrolled in public, two-year, commuter institutions. Counseling, academic advising, and the negotiation of financial assistance are essential to these students, not merely rearranged class hours.

Two-year institutions need to devote staff and energy to a comprehensive program of supportive services, including development time for aggressive recruitment of federal and private funds for such purposes. When federal programs designed to provide such assistance are threatened, two-year colleges, located in nearly every congressional district in the country, must involve themselves in attempts to rescue these programs. Two-year colleges have not advanced their own interests within Congress and the U.S. Office of Education.

RECOMMENDATION #12

Two-year and senior institutions must work together to alleviate problems of transfer between the two levels.

While this recommendation surely is tired of seeing itself only in print, negotiating transfer constantly appears to be an impediment to baccalaureate completion by students, particularly minority students who are so overwhelmingly clustered in two-year institutions. Most senior schools have arrangements for articulation, although this frequently means that registrars merely familiarize themselves with other institutions' catalogs. This is important, but hardly sufficient.

As state professional associations must examine their practices for continuity and fairness, so must admissions officers and advisers communicate concern about their overlapping responsibilities. Case studies conducted for this book revealed a number of transfer horror stories, including sophomores being held in two-year colleges for the equivalent of three years of work and branch campus courses not being admitted for purposes of transfer to main campus programs. While these stories are striking as exceptions, the process of transferring from one school to another by definition requires more coordination and planning than does initially enrolling in a baccalaureate institution. Two-year college advisers are more important than ever four-year advisers in this regard, and should be given the resources to link effectively with senior institutions. Academic and administrative officers should make ease-of-transfer a high institutional priority, as they frequently do ease-of-admission. The feeder system of two year and baccalaureate institutions cannot succeed if convenient two year access contrasts sharply with uncoordinated exit practices.

RECOMMENDATION #13

Two-year institutions must upgrade their financial aid and development offices.

Several studies analyzed in this Report noted the low esteem in which financial aid offices and development programs are held by two-year colleges; indeed, only affirmative action officers are consistently less central to two-year institutional administrative hierarchies. This policy seems shortsighted. Although two-year tuitions are, in most cases, lower than baccalaureate tuitions, additional fees, books, and other expenses (as well as foregone wages) would qualify many more two-year students for federal, state, and private financial assistance. It appears that the low tuition levels have lulled two-year administrators into downgrading the need for experienced and capable personnel in financial aid offices. As a result, these institutions do not receive proportional shares of grant, loan, or work study funds. Particularly as tax referenda threaten once-secure community-funded institutions, it will behoove administrators to strengthen and upgrade existing offices for seeking aid and for notifying students of its availability.

The same logic applies to the need for development offices: relatively small investments now will result in a more competitive posture for seeking outside funds. If every earlier recommendation concerning two-year federal programs were implemented tomorrow, it would still be necessary for two-year colleges to upgrade their fund-seeking capabilities in financial aid and development offices—which could be combined in small schools—in order to compete successfully for funds. Comprehensive two-year colleges are integral members of their business and academic communities, and many honorable and appropriate fund raising activities flow naturally from this relationship. Few two-year colleges do this, or do it well, while baccalaureate and graduate institutions have done it since there were federal programs.

RECOMMENDATION #14

Two-year colleges must practice aggressive affirmative action in all programs, particularly in programs for which there are admissions criteria.

Increasingly, two-year college technical and terminal curricula are receiving more applications than there are available spaces in the programs. On many campuses with predominantly minority enrollments, these programs are predominantly white. In some of these programs, significant numbers of college graduates are enrolled to train for alternative careers or to learn technical skills. Because many minority students have poor high school academic preparation, it is important that technical programs use life experiences, community services, and other alternative criteria in determining admissions standards.

There is a tendency to employ numerical indices and quantitative measures when judging large numbers of applications, but administrative convenience must not dictate admissions practices. Because two-year students have fewer leadership development opportunities, fewer extracurricular activities, and less time in which to prepare for declared majors than do students in four-year institutions, traditional means of evaluating student applications are less appropriate than they are in baccalaureate, graduate, or professional admissions, where fuller dossiers can be compiled. In technical programs designed to meet community professional and paraprofessional needs, minority community personnel needs also should be considered in assembling heterogeneous classes.

RECOMMENDATION #15

High schools should emphasize college attendance for all students who have the capability, and should upgrade academic advising resources to accomplish this purpose.

It is acknowledged from the outset that not all students want to attend college, or can do college-level work. But if schools must err, it should be on the side of encouraging college attendance for those who might choose not to attend, and not on the side of discouraging those who would choose to attend. While recruiting and skills development necessary to successful athletic programs are widely acknowledged, the aggressive academic advising, networking, and guidance functions are frequently perceived as peripheral to high school missions. Nothing could be further from the truth. College prerequisite courses, particularly science and math, must be started early. Suburban, college preparatory institutions have always known this and have devised rigorous pre-college counseling programs that give the assistance necessary to coordinate application processes.

Schools not employing such procedures stand in stark contrast. Counselors frequently are assigned to their positions for precisely the wrong reasons, or for incompetence rather than the crucial competencies required for networking. The skills required include an ability to gather essential information, to match students with appropriate institutions, to assist students and their parents in negotiating the awesome application procedures, and to advocate aggressively for these students. Continuity and coordination are essential components of this office, and advising personnel should be given portfolio to accomplish the tasks. At the very least, schools should maintain centralized information files and encourage students to browse regularly through the information. Finally, parents must exert the pressure necessary to assure this function is being emphasized, including aggressive lobbying of appropriate officials for maintaining and expanding local, state, and federal programs designed to assist students in negotiating information.

RECOMMENDATION #16

In performing their responsibilities, high schools should emphasize reading, test taking, and study skills.

Once pre-college obstacles have been negotiated and students are enrolled in appropriate schools, the academic needs of students become apparent. The emphasis upon negotiating skills and needs in earlier recommendations has been intended in no way to slight curricular or academic needs. These are basic to college enrollment and completion. The suggestions have been stressed, however, because the external, supportive elements are more easily manipulated and improved by policy recommendations than is the learning process itself.

One additional supportive service essential to college attendance is a well-developed developmental education program, one stressing fundamental reading, test taking, and study skills. While these appear obvious, many otherwise bright students enter college without having mastered these basic habits. All classes should emphasize reading, particularly self-directed reading; in-service workshops and continuing education should be made available to teachers for this purpose. Test taking and reducing test anxiety are other curricular activities that help make high school students more competitive in their applications to colleges. The cost of commercial testing practice courses may be prohibitive even for middle class students, while economies of scale could enable homerooms, study halls, or after-class periods to incorporate such skill development. Finally, the non-structured nature of college enrollment frequently gives freshmen excessive free time for which they are not prepared. Basic study skills and time management training could be incorporated into high school pre-college curricula so that the students will not encounter such a counterproductive culture shock when faced with the need for independent study and self-direction.

RECOMMENDATION #17

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges [AACJC] should acknowledge its role in representing minority students interests, and should advocate for minority affairs.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the umbrella association representing the institutional sector enrolling most minority students, is predominantly white and male in its leadership. While it does have several special interest councils (Council on Black American Affairs, El Congreso Nacional de Asuntos Colegiales, Center for Women's Opportunities), these remain peripheral to the affairs of the Association. The Office of Minority Programs has been dismantled without the concomitant mainstreaming of minority interests or the inclusion of minority professionals in decision-making positions. As a result, minority programming is an *ad hoc*, soft money,

occasional concern in an association that officially represents many minority interests in higher education. AACJC should bring minorities into its leadership, and should initiate programs at all levels to sensitize its membership to minority concerns.

RECOMMENDATION #18

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges [AACJC] should regularly gather racial and ethnic data from its member institutions.

The Association has gathered enrollment and program data and published them for a number of years, but has neither regularly gathered nor published racial and ethnic data since 1973. These data were not even collated from federally-collected racial and ethnic enrollment data, although such data have been available for 1972, 1974 and 1976. As a result, the recognized advocate for the institutions with the most minority enrollments did not maintain systematic or comprehensive records of its minority membership.

Minority data were gathered for the 1978-79 year, as residual funds for a Native American foundation grant program were diverted to the data gathering project. While the return to gathering such data already collected by member institutions is noteworthy, permanent staff and regular funding, not soft money left from another minority program, should be allocated. This task should be part of an aggressive campaign to increase AACJC awareness of its role in minority education.

. . . . . .

Listing these suggestions, one cannot help but be struck by how mundane and elementary any such recommendations must seem, even if all were to be implemented fully. It is clear that even well-intentioned institutions often fail to meet the needs of minority students, but it is essential that exerted efforts be undertaken to remedy, at least in part, historical exclusion. These data, discussions, and recommendations can serve to tap the reservoir of good will in the majority. Minorities represent people rich in traditions, cultures, and service. Higher education is poorer for its repeated failure to allow this resource its full development and expression.

CHAPTER ONE

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Institutional Characteristics

Perhaps no single adjective summarizes the two-year college better than does "rapidly-grown." While the number of private two-year colleges has declined slightly, public two-year institutions have nearly tripled in the years 1958 to 1974, increasing from 309 to 901 (Table 1). The period between 1966 and 1974 saw more than one new public two year college open each week, more than doubling the existing number of institutions. Not only were new institutions opened, but existing institutions grew larger. Growth patterns, shown in Table 2, indicate that the number of small institutions (under 1000 students) declined from 452 in 1968 to 389 in 1976, while the number of very large institutions (over 10,000 students) grew from 33 (4% of all two-year institutions) to 89 (8%) in the same period of time.

Table 1. Number of Two-Year Institutions, by Control

	Number of Institutions						
	1958	1962	1966	1970	1974	1975	1976
Total	**557**	**628**	**685**	**897**	**1,151**	**1,151**	**1,141**
Public	309	366	408	659	901	901	901
Private	248	262	277	238	250	250	240

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education*, 1976 Edition, Table 1.18 thru 1974; 1978 Edition, Table 3.9 to 1976.

Table 2. Distribution of Two-Year Institutions by Enrollment Size Over Time

Year and Size of Enrollment	All Institutions		Two-Year Institutions	
	Number	Enrollment	Number	Enrollment
Fall 1968				
Total	**2,483**	**7,513,091**	**864**	**1,792,822**
Under 200	302	33,637	114	12,565
200 to 499	341	120,434	155	54,837
500 to 999	557	411,691	183	134,023
1,000 to 2,499	627	963,971	221	338,074
2,500 to 4,999	266	947,025	99	354,835
5,000 to 9,999	211	1,492,850	59	401,481
10,000 to 19,999	119	1,624,674	28	366,068
20,000 to 29,999	35	829,804	4	94,992
30,000 or more	25	1,089,005	1	35,947
Fall 1972				
Total	**2,665**	**9,214,860**	**964**	**2,665,787**
Under 200	262	28,947	72	9,058
200 to 499	367	130,019	152	53,810
500 to 999	542	396,178	176	127,367
1,000 to 2,499	680	1,062,698	270	423,687
2,500 to 4,999	328	1,161,428	143	509,107
5,000 to 9,999	259	1,841,726	93	634,559
10,000 to 19,999	149	2,093,994	51	718,600
20,000 to 29,999	44	1,014,850	6	142,480
30,000 or more	34	1,485,020	1	47,119
Fall 1976				
Total	**3,067**	**11,121,426**	**1,143**	**3,916,613**
1 to 1,000	1,204	580,918	389	209,214
1,001 to 2,499	809	1,293,773	325	527,002
2,500 to 4,999	411	1,460,464	186	651,554
5,000 to 9,999	356	2,574,697	154	1,115,465
10,000 to 19,999	193	2,663,459	74	1,042,896
20,000 or more	94	2,548,115	15	370,482

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education*, 1976 Edition, Table 1.19 (1968, 1972) 1978 Edition, Table 3.10 (1976). ISEP staff calculations.

Another gauge of size would be to compare two-year institutions with four-year institutions, particularly the largest systems of public higher education. Appendix I rank-orders the sixty largest campuses in the country, including ten two-year colleges. Of these two-year campuses, only the largest, Miami-Dade, enrolls more full-time than part-time students.

In 1976, constituting 37% of all institutions, two-year colleges enrolled 35% of total enrollments. Most notably, the ratio of public to private two-year enrollments exceeds the public share in baccalaureate and graduate institutions: public two-year enrollments accounted for 97% of all two-year enrollments in 1976 (Table 3). The shrinkage in the number of private two-year institutions has been accompanied by a smaller proportional share of enrollments, despite slightly increased total private enrollment.

Table 3. Number of Institutions of Higher Education and Enrollments, 1976

	Institution				Public as Percent of Total
	Number	Percent	Public	Private	
Total	**3,067**	**100**	**1,465**	**1,502**	**48**
University	161	5	96	65	60
Four-Year	1,763	57	462	1,301	26
Two-Year	1,143	37	907	236	79
			Enrollment (in thousands)		
Total	**11,012**	**100**	**8,653**	**2,359**	**79**
University	2,780	25	2,080	700	75
Four-Year	4,349	39	2,822	1,527	65
Two-Year	3,883	35	3,752	132	97

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 Edition, Tables 3.4 and 3.10. ISEP staff calculations.

Figures may not total 100 because of rounding

Comparative income and expenditure data lend further understanding to the differences in institutional missions and resources among institutions. Most notable in the income patterns shown in Table 4 is the difference in sources of income by institutional type and sector. In the public sector, two-year institutions are slightly more reliant upon tuition as a source of income than are senior institutions—a surprising finding given lower tuition rates in community colleges—but are far more heavily reliant upon local, unrestricted appropriations. Two-year institutions are less able to generate income by "sales and services," in part because of fewer income-generating health services, and in part because of fewer dormitory and refectory enterprises. In the private sector, institutional type differences also occur, most notably in the higher reliance upon tuition and fees by two-year schools than that by senior institutions. Private, two-year institutions, like their public counterparts, are less reliant upon federal sources of funding than are senior institutions, although, unlike public two-year colleges, they do raise a large portion of their income by auxiliary (dormitory) enterprises.

Table 4. Current Funds Revenues of Institutions of Higher Education, by Control and Level of Institution and by Source of Revenue, 1975-76.

	Universities		Other Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
			(Dollars in Thousands)			
PUBLIC						
Total	**$11,321,977**	**100.0**	**$10,519,424**	**100.0**	**$4,993,497**	**100.0**
Tuition and fees from students	1,438,651	12.7	1,309,623	12.5	729,292	14.6
Federal government	2,007,136	17.7	1,597,005	15.2	396,981	8.0
Unrestricted appropriations	265,268	2.3	402,863	3.8	113,747	2.3
Unrestricted grants and contracts	204,766	1.8	98,915	0.9	19,343	0.4
Restricted grants and contracts	1,339,737	11.8	894,707	8.5	263,823	5.3
Independent operations (FFRDC) [1]	197,365	1.7	200,520	1.9	63	(2)
State governments	4,723,670	41.7	5,000,755	47.5	2,233,912	44.7
Unrestricted appropriations	4,536,725	40.1	4,874,528	46.3	2,153,811	43.1
Unrestricted grants and contracts	12,030	0.1	9,355	(2)	13,527	0.3
Restricted grants and contracts	174,915	1.5	116,872	1.1	86,574	1.3
Local governments	48,582	0.4	266,538	2.5	1,184,408	23.7
Unrestricted appropriations	27,195	0.2	219,598	2.1	1,168,800	23.4
Unrestricted grants and contracts	1,601	(2)	1,841	(2)	3,816	(2)
Restricted grants and contracts	19,786	0.2	45,099	0.4	11,792	0.2
Private gifts, grants, and contracts	403,720	3.6	189,223	1.8	23,466	0.5
Unrestricted	32,294	0.3	17,974	0.2	8,782	0.2
Restricted	371,426	3.3	171,249	1.6	14,684	0.3
Endowment income	66,026	0.6	28,599	0.3	2,373	(2)
Unrestricted	28,672	0.3	13,718	0.1	2,199	(2)
Restricted	37,354	0.3	14,881	0.1	173	(2)
Sales and services	2,410,198	21.3	1,958,089	18.6	317,882	6.4
Educational activities	279,703	2.5	124,118	1.2	19,437	0.4
Auxiliary enterprises	1,465,763	12.9	1,125,304	10.7	298,445	6.0
Hospitals	664,732	5.9	708,667	6.7	0	0.0
Other sources	223,994	2.0	169,592	1.6	100,184	2.0
PRIVATE						
Total	**$6,061,835**	**100.0**	**$6,495,804**	**100.0**	**$310,629**	**100.0**
Tuition and fees from students	1,681,092	27.7	2,847,025	43.8	166,259	53.5
Federal government	1,645,000	27.1	812,562	12.5	18,476	5.9
Unrestricted appropriations	69,155	1.1	52,511	0.8	2,933	0.9
Unrestricted grants and contracts	231,917	3.8	65,856	1.0	1,881	0.6
Restricted grants and contracts	958,428	15.8	414,345	6.4	13,650	4.4
Independent operations (FFRDC) [1]	385,520	6.4	279,850	4.3	12	(2)
State governments	137,858	2.3	150,982	2.3	8,709	2.8
Unrestricted appropriations	72,343	1.2	94,546	1.5	4,046	1.3
Unrestricted grants and contracts	6,066	0.1	13,955	0.2	2,432	0.8
Restricted grants and contracts	59,449	1.0	42,481	0.7	2,231	0.7
Local governments	76,110	1.3	38,986	0.6	2,351	0.8
Unrestricted appropriations	74	(2)	2,304	(2)	1,573	0.5
Unrestricted grants and contracts	7,469	0.1	3,006	(2)	413	0.1
Restricted grants and contracts	68,567	1.1	33,676	0.5	365	0.1

Private gifts, grants, and contracts	558,407	9.2	704,340	10.8	37,880	12 2
Unrestricted	182,622	3.0	521,379	8.0	33,318	10.7
Restricted	375,785	6.2	182,961	2.8	4,562	1.5
Endowment income	325,847	5.4	259,639	4.0	4,987	1.6
Unrestricted	148,148	2.4	170,899	2.6	4,304	1.4
Restricted	177,699	2.9	88,740	1.4	683	0.2
Sales and services	1,474,718	24.3	1,464,887	22.6	61,607	19.8
Educational activities	170,180	2.8	49,959	0.8	2,022	0.7
Auxiliary enterprises	568,945	9.4	1,029,579	15.9	59,585	19.2
Hospitals	735,593	12.1	385,349	5.9	0	0.0
Other sources	162,784	2.7	217,886	3.4	10,359	3.3

[1] Generally includes only those revenues associated with major federally funded research and development centers.

[2] Less than 0.05 percent.

NOTE: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, ***The Condition of Education***, 1978 Edition, Table 5.2.

TABLE 5. Current Funds Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers of Institutions of Higher Education, by Control and Level of Institution and by Purpose: 1975-76

Purpose	Universities		Other Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
			(Dollars in thousands)			
PUBLIC						
Total	**$11,081,437**	**100.0**	**$10,310,430**	**100.0**	**$4,792,089**	**100.0**
Educational and general	8,715,556	78.7	8,078,014	78.3	4,489,432	93.7
Student education [1]	5,953,472	53.7	6,817,843	66.1	4,147,979	86.6
Research [2]	1,565,659	14.1	574,046	5.6	14,736	0.3
Scholarships and fellowships [3]	355,164	3.2	305,669	3.0	137,682	2.9
Public service	728,537	6.6	226,798	2.2	80,373	1.7
Mandatory transfers [4]	112,725	1.0	153,657	1.5	108,656	2.3
Auxiliary enterprises [5]	1,406,845	12.7	1,118,757	10.9	302,514	6.3
Hospitals and independent operations [6]	959,032	8.7	1,113,659	10.8	143	(7)
PRIVATE						
Total	**5,996,450**	**100.0**	**6,422,901**	**100.0**	**299,869**	**100.0**
Educational and general	4,336,017	72.3	4,733,462	73.7	246,204	82.1
Student education [1]	2,924,103	48.8	3,830,663	59.6	216,299	72.1
Research [2]	925,223	15.4	206,777	3.2	922	0.3
Scholarships and fellowships [3]	349,920	5.8	468,732	7.3	18,692	6.2
Public service	88,744	1.5	111,863	1.7	2,284	0.8
Mandatory transfers [4]	48,027	0.8	115,426	1.8	8,007	2.7
Auxiliary enterprises [5]	577,242	9.6	1,017,818	15.8	53,665	17.9
Hospitals and independent operations	1,083,192	18.1	671,621	10.5	0	0

1 Includes instruction, academic support, libraries, institutional support, student services and operation and maintenance of the plant. These are the items most nearly comparable to "student education" expenditures reported prior to 1974-75.

2 Includes all sponsored reserach and other separately budgeted research with the exception of federally funded research and development centers which are included under "independent operations."

3 Moneys given in the form of outright grants and trainee stipends to individuals enrolled in formal coursework, either for credit or not. Includes aid in the form of tuition or fee remissions. Prior to 1974-75 this category was entitled "student aid" and was not an educational and general item.

4 Mandatory transfers from current funds are those that must be made to fulfill a binding legal obligation of the institution. Includes debt service provisions relating to academic buildings, including amounts set aside for debt retirement and interest, and required provisions for renewal and replacements to the extent not financed from other sources.

5 Includes residence halls, food services, college store, and intercollegiate athletics. Includes mandatory transfers from auxiliary enterprises.

6 Includes expenditures for hospitals and for "independent operations" which are generally limited to expenditures of federally funded reserach and development centers. Includes mandatory transfers from hospitals and independent operations.

7 Less than 0.05 percent.

Note. Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, ***The Condition of Education***, 1978 Edition, Table 5.1.

Table 5 reveals similar intra-type and intra-sector patterns. As did Table 4's figures, these figures show the effect of mission upon resource allocation. In both public and private sectors, two-year institutions spent the largest share among all institutions for "student education," roughly equivalent to instructional costs. The additional missions of research and public service in senior institutions reveal resource patterns not central to two-year institutions; for most two-year colleges, "community" or "public" service means delivery of instruction, not the extensive clinical or research programs generally sponsored by baccalaureate and graduate institutions. As before, residential facilities and auxiliary enterprises differed across sectors in the two-year institutional spending patterns.

Table 6. Educational Resources and Benefits of Public Institutions

Type of Institution	Dollars per FTE Student					
	Educational and General Expenditures	Value of Buildings, Land, and Equipment	Library Expenditures	Expentitures for Financial Aid	Tuition	"Subsidy" (Educational and General Plus Aid Expenditures Minus Tuition)
Two-year colleges	1,533	3,982	71	60	385	1,208
Four-year colleges						
Low selectivity	1,534	5,514	83	77	358	1,253
Medium selectivity	1,758	6,467	98	94	404	1,448
High selectivity	2,523	7,875	104	129	473	2,179
Universities						
Low selectivity	3,101	7,710	109	133	490	2,744
Medium selectivity	3,230	8,453	116	190	564	2,850
High selectivity	5,408	12,320	212	316	519	5,205

Source: Astin, 1975a, Tables 3, 4.

While these figures do reveal institutional characteristics, they are judgement-free. Table 6 is more judgemental, in two respects: it disaggregates resource data to allow comparability among institutional types, and it reflects legislators' (and other appropriations personnel's) judgements concerning the value of institutional types, as inferred from per capita expenditures. While there are states that have moved to program budgets to "equalize" appropriations for similar programs at different institutional types (e.g., x dollars per FTE student for English composition classes at technical institutes or state universities), there remain major differences in educational resources allocated to two-year colleges and senior institutions.

Table 6, a composite of Alexander Astin's research (1975a), shows the extent to which educational resources allocated per FTE student differ among public institutional types. In each instance, two-year colleges receive less money per FTE student than do senior colleges: educational and general expenditures, value of facilities, library and expenditures for financial aid. The summary category, 'subsidy,' is a combination of educational and general expenditures and financial aid packages from which tuition is subtracted. Astin has noted of such hierachical arrangements:

In one sense, these data provide strong support for the notion that 'them that has, gets.' More important, they show clearly that 'educational opportunity,' as measured by the amount contributed to that student's education through public funds, is by no means equivalent in different types of public institutions. Here again is another important side effect of a hierarchically arranged public system based on selective admissions: students who are denied access to the universities and more selective four-year colleges (including a disproportionate share of the low income and minority students) receive substantially less public subsidy for their postsecondary education than do students who manage to enter the more selective public colleges and universities (Astin 1975a, pp. 7-8).

Thus far, institutional characteristics of size and resources have been examined, noting the rapid growth patterns and increasing role of two year colleges in providing increased access to postsecondary education. The extent to which two-year colleges have accounted for increased *minority* access is shown in Table 7, a centerpiece table in this Report. The most obvious characteristic of the data is the overwhelming presence of minority students in two-year colleges. A better index of the minority presence is each minority group's two-year enrollment as a percentage of that group's total undergraduate enrollments. This calculation more graphically depicts the role of the two-year institutions in providing access to minority students. Blacks enroll 50 percent of their numbers in two-year institutions; Asians, 52 percent; Hispanics, 59 percent; American Indians, 67 percent. White students, who constitute seventy-nine percent of all two-year enrollments, concentrate 45% of their numbers in these institutions.

When full-time attendance patterns are disaggregated, the concentration of minority students in two-year colleges is more evident. Asians enroll 33% of their full-time students in two-year institutions; Blacks, 37%; Hispanics, 45%; American Indians, 48%. Only 27% of full-time white students are enrolled in two-year institutions. To be sure, several historically black two-year institutions and federal and tribal Indian two-year colleges are residential, mitigating somewhat the adverse effects of commuter institutions. However, this demonstrable concentration suggests that minority students are not transferring in large numbers into senior baccalaureate institutions.

Appendices II and III should be read in tandem with Table 7, as all three report the concentration of minority students in two-year institutions, the increasing enrollment patterns in two-year colleges, and the resulting disproportionate concentration of full-time students. In Appendix II, the concentration and location of minority students are examined, presenting the 150 institutions that have the most heavily-concentrated minority enrollments. Appendix III examines the list in further depth, disaggregating the urban institutions from Appendix II.

The rubric employed to determine minority institutional concentrations in Appendix II was the following:

Black:	40% Black enrollments *or* 1000 Black students
Hispanic:	40% Hispanic enrollments *or* 10% Hispanic enrollments of 3000 total students
American Indians:	40% Indian enrollments *or* 10% Indian enrollments of 3000 total students
Oriental:	40% Oriental enrollments *or* 10% Oriental enrollments of 3000 total students
or	Total 1000 minority students
or	20% total minority students of 15,000 total students
or	50% total minority

Table 7. Racial/Ethnic Enrollments, 1976

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		American Indian		Total Minority		Non-Resident Alien		Aggregate
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE															
Full-time	4,820,716	81.2	605,116	10.1	263,982	4.4	103,247	1.7	38,420	.6	1,010,765	17.0	104,421	1.7	5,935,905
Part-time	2,070,377	80.3	261,199	10.2	145,682	5.6	51,700	2.0	22,996	.8	481,577	18.6	25,454	1.0	2,577,408
Total	**6,891,093**	**80.9**	**866,315**	**10.1**	**409,664**	**4.8**	**154,947**	**1.8**	**61,416**	**.7**	**1,492,342**	**17.5**	**129,875**	**1.5**	**8,513,310**
TWO-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE															
Full-time	1,280,872		221,374		119,444		33,908		18,424		393,650		16,253		1,690,775
Part-time	1,799,927		207,849		122,565		46,510		22,820		399,744		26,172		2,225,843
Total	**3,080,799**		**429,723**		**242,009**		**80,418**		**41,244**		**793,394**		**42,425**		**3,916,618**
Two-Year as Percent of Undergraduate Category	**.44**		**.49**		**.59**		**.51**		**.67**		**.53**		**.32**		**.46**
Two-Year College Full-Time as Percent of Undergraduate Full-time	**.26**		**.37**		**.45**		**.33**		**.47**		**.38**		**.15**		**.28**

Source: Unpublished data, Office for Civil Rights; National Center for Education Statistics, ***The Condition of Education***, 1978 Edition, Table 3.6; ISEP staff calculations.

NOTE: Hispanic enrollments include Puerto Rico.

These eleven rules sorted out institutions with significant minority presences. The 150 institutions represent 13% of all two-year institutions in the OCR data, and include colleges in 29 states. Fifty-seven colleges in the list are located in California.

Over half of Appendix II's list represent urban campuses; these are analyzed in more detail in Appendix III. The number of states shrunk from 29 to 23, while California's colleges dropped from 57 to 35. Nonetheless, these 83 urban two-year institutions represent over forty percent of minority two-year enrollments: 21 percent American Indian, 43 percent Black, 43 percent Hispanic, and 45 percent Asian. These concentrations are an important key to understanding minority access into postsecondary education, for even as minority students are maldistributed throughout the postsecondary hierarchy, they are similarly maldistributed throughout the two year tier. *Seven percent of the two-year institutions enroll forty-two percent of the minority two-year students. These 83 urban two-year colleges, fewer than three percent of all postsecondary institutions, enroll nearly twenty-three percent of all undergraduate minority students.*

Strong *prima facie* evidence of inequitable access is available, and civil rights groups are increasingly vigilant in higher education issues (MALDEF, 1978; Middleton, 1978). Multiunit districts must examine campus locations for disproportional racial impact, and schools not serving minority students when minority populations are proximate must evaluate their policies to eradicate barriers to admission.

Ironically, those institutions without barriers to minority students find themselves threatened by public perceptions concerning minority access. Historically-minority institutions, always underfinanced, are increasingly under attack as anachronisms. Higher education desegregation litigation, most notably the *Adams* case,* has called into question the existence of institutions established to serve minority students; resulting state plans to desegregate public systems of higher education could affect the status of the historically Black two-year colleges, listed in Appendix IV (Haynes, 1978). Direct federal support for traditionally Indian two-year institutions is reported in Appendix V; additional federal funding is authorized by Congress and disbursed to tribal two-year institutions ("Carter Signs," 1978). There is no formal network of historically Hispanic two-year institutions, although there have recently emerged alternative schools (Southwest Network, 1974; Arce, 1978) and an identifiably Puerto Rican two-year college in New York, Hostos Community College (Castro, 1974). There is no network of Asian institutions, although the Hawaii system does enroll many Asian students.

Ethnic institutions have emerged as alternatives to the mainstream education system, which is perceived as being unresponsive to minority students' needs. As argued earlier in this chapter, it is questionable whether minority students have achieved access into all sectors of postsecondary education. If a case of first impressions can be made suggesting systematic lack of access and inequitable distribution, then the burden of proving otherwise would fall upon those policymakers and educators who administer postsecondary educational institutions.

Adams v. Califano, 356 F. Supp. 92 (D.D.C. 1973).

CHAPTER TWO

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Student Characteristics

One of the major themes of this Report is that definitions of access must incorporate the corollary concept of distribution. By this criterion, institutional data report unmistakable findings of maldistribution throughout the system and skewedness toward urban public two-year colleges. The clearest evidence of this maldistribution is the finding that disproportionately large numbers of minority full-time students are achieving access in two-year institutions and that these institutions receive markedly lower per capita appropriations and educational subsidies than do senior colleges.

Reasons advanced for the disproportionate enrollment of minority students include proximity, open admissions, convenience, and low cost. Despite widespread financial aid programs, college attendance and the type of college attended are income-related. Attendance patterns, such as those evident in Table 8, appear to confirm Karabel's thesis (1972) that socio-economic status and class distinctions are evident in the hierarchical arrangement of institutions. Students from high Socio-Economic Status (SES) families are far more likely to attend senior than junior institutions or vocational schools, as can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Enrollments by Family and Median Income, and Institutional Type, 1972-1976, in Percentages

		Dollars in thousands						Median Income Constant $ (1972)
	Total %	0–$4*	$4–$10	$10–$15	$15–$20	$20–$25	$25	
1972								
Two-year	100.0	11.6	30.2	31.5	12.6	6.3	7.9	11,126
Four-year	100.0	7.0	22.5	29.4	15.7	9.5	14.9	13,153
University	100.0	3.4	17.6	29.5	17.0	12.2	20.3	14,908
1974								
Two-year	100.0	9.1	22.8	31.5	14.3	10.3	12.2	11,056
Four-year	100.0	6.8	18.8	26.4	15.6	11.9	20.4	12,559
University	100.0	3.6	14.0	26.2	17.0	14.0	25.2	14,419
1976								
Two-year	100.0	8.3	18.5	26.3	17.3	12.4	17.1	10,635
Four-year	100.0	5.9	14.8	22.3	17.1	13.7	26.3	11,777
University	100.0	3.2	9.8	18.9	17.2	15.6	35.3	14,911

Source: Unpublished ACE/CIRP data; CEEB staff calculations.

Table 9. College Attendance Status of the Class of 1972 High School Graduate in 1972, 1973 and 1974

	Total	Type of Enrollment				
		Four-Yr. College	Two-Yr. College	Dropout	Completion	Non-College
All persons, in 1972	**100.00**	**29.38**	**14.51**	–	–	**56.11**
Attended a four-year college in 1972						
Attended in 1973	29.38	23.60	.93	–	4.85	–
Attended in 1974:						
4-year college	21.60	20.13	.26	–	1.22	–
2-year college	.93	.34	.35	–	.24	–
Completion	.08	.00	.08	–	–	–
Dropout	6.77	3.14	.23	–	3.40	–
Attended a two-year college in 1972						
Attended in 1973	14.51	.90	9.09	.15	4.38	–
Attended in 1974:						
4-year college	3.54	.68	2.63	.01	.22	–
2-year college	3.40	.05	2.75	.01	.58	–
Completion	1.76	.00	1.76	–	–	–
Dropout	5.69	.16	1.95	–	3.58	–
Non-college	.13	–	–	.13	–	–
Did not attend college in 1972						
Attended in 1973	56.11	2.12	2.41	–	–	51.58
Attended in 1974:						
4-year college	2.83	1.41	.14	–	–	1.29
2-year college	2.67	.07	1.09	–	–	1.51
Completion	.21	.00	.21	–	–	–
Dropout	1.61	.64	.97	–	–	–
Non-college	48.78	–	–	–	–	48.78

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, ***The Condition of Education***, 1977 Edition, Table 4.14.

Even with the establishment of need-based federal programs, the gap between the family income of two-year students and that of four-year students has not closed. In 1972, the difference between two-year students' family incomes under $15,000 (73.3%) and those of families with university students (50.5%) was 22.8%; by 1976, this gap had narrowed only to 21.2%. Access, then, is a combination of factors, including college eligibility and financial resources.

College attendance has another facet, one that has a qualitative dimension: retention. There is clear evidence that retention rates are lower in two-year colleges than they are in four-year institutions; data on the impact of institutional types upon retention suggest that students' chances of persisting are greatly improved when they attend senior institutions (Chickering, 1974). Alexander Astin notes that attendance by bacalaureate-aspiring students at two-year college reduces students' chances of completing the degree by twelve percent (Astin, 1975a, Table 3). The lowered likelihood of completion is due to the lack of residential facilities at two-year colleges, problems inherent in necessarily transferring to another school, and reduced opportunities for financial assistance.

National Longitudinal Study (NLS) data indicate that retention is a complex activity. For instance, within two years of college enrollment, the High School Class of 1972, when adjusted for college attendance rates by type of institution, had shrunk by 23% in four-year colleges and by 39% in two-year colleges (Table 9). Complex transactions further complicate the persistence patterns, for there is much activity beneath the placid surface as many students transfer between institutional types and among colleges within each type (Willingham, 1972; Brim and Achilles, 1976). Despite ambiguity inherent in the transfer patterns, two trends are clear in NLS data: students with high ability and aptitude persist, transfer upward (two to four year), and graduate in rates higher than those with lower ability; and second, students with higher aspirations tend to persist, transfer upward, and graduate in rates higher than those for lower-aspiring students.

The aggregate patterns, however, tend to homogenize the internal data, for it is clear that dropping out, like enrolling, is an activity resulting from many motivations and conditions. Studies have found, for instance, that dropouts and persisters frequently resemble each other statistically and that characteristics of both groups may be virtually indistinguishable (Pandy, 1973). More often, there are measures of alienation or noninvolvement that have some limited predictive value in identifying dropout proneness (Brawer, 1973; Astin, 1975b; Baumgart and Johnstone, 1977). NLS data, in disaggregated findings analyzing withdrawal, suggest that different reasons for leaving school motivate different groups of students.

In each case, except Hispanic females in senior institutions, white persistence surpasses minority persistence. The Hispanic female persistence, if accurate, corroborates Munoz and Garcia-Bahne's finding (1978) that Mexican-American women encounter significant stress in college, but cope with the stress better than do Mexican-American men. Persistence patterns in four-year colleges do not reveal statistically significant racial/ethnic differences, although minorities (except Hispanic women) cite nonacademic reasons for withdrawal more frequently than do majority students. Minority male students give academic withdrawal rationales less frequently than do majority male students. The persistence patterns in two-year colleges, however, show very different results. While female rates of withdrawal do not vary significantly, Black and Hispanic male patterns of retention do vary significantly, though in different patterns from each other. Black men cite nonacademic reasons nearly 50% more often than majority men, while Hispanic males more closely

Table 10. Total Withdrawal (in percent) of Those Entering College by Fall of 1973: by Sex and Race

	Male			Female		
	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White
Four-Year College						
Withdrawal	27.03	27.90	22.66	27.40	21.20	23.93
Academic	5.88	4.45	6.18	6.76	4.81	3.99
Nonacademic	21.15	23.45	16.47	20.64	16.39	19.94
N**	294	88	2,769	453	75	2,476
Two-Year College						
Withdrawal	53.60	47.11	38.72*	43.77	43.36	37.81
Academic	6.28	12.67	6.33	6.85	5.06	4.53
Nonacademic	47.32	34.44	32.39*	36.92	38.30	33.28
N**	145	110	1,405	214	100	1,238

* The percentage for Blacks was significantly greater than that for whites ($|z| > 2.33$, $p < .01$).

** Number in Pool.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, ***Withdrawal From Institutions of Higher Education***, National Longitudinal Study, 1977.

resemble the majority. However, in academic withdrawal patterns, Hispanic men doubled majority male rates, which were close to Black male percentages. These findings, tentative though they may be, suggest that different retention strategies may need to be employed for different groups.

Academic and nonacademic withdrawal patterns further suggest that this attrition has many causes. Tables 11 and 12 report in more detail self-reported reasons for withdrawal. These findings show patterns in withdrawal rates that vary by institutional type.

A notable feature in these findings is the extent to which nonacademic reasons overshadow academic withdrawal reasons: in four-year colleges the rate is two to one while in two-year colleges it is four to one (NCES, "Self-Reported," 1977, p. 1). In actuality, the reasons for withdrawal are unlikely to be as separate and discrete as are implied by the NLS data, even allowing for the non-additive nature of the questionnaire. However, there do emerge patterns that seem to reflect the different purposes for which students enter four and two-year institutions.

Table 11. Withdrawals and Reentry Patterns, 1974[a]

	Percent Citing Reason	
NONACADEMIC WITHDRAWALS[A]		
Reason cited:[B]	Four-Year College	Two-Year College
financial difficulties	32	25
marriage	28	14
desire to get practical experience	28	35
school work not relevant	21	17
offered a good job	16	33
other	47	49
ACADEMIC WITHDRAWALS		
Reason cited:		
failing or not doing well	87	82
courses too hard	25	21
desire to get practical experience	42	30
financial difficulties	38	32
school work not relevant	28	20
offered a good job	23	22
other	33	31

RE-ENTRY PATTERNS	Withdrawal			
	Academic		Nonacademic	
Type of Institution Reentered:	Four-Year College	Two-Year College	Four-Year College	Two-Year
Two-year college	18	03	28	06
Four-year college	05	15	05	13
Total	**23**	**18**	**33**	**19**

[A] Nonacademic withdrawals are defined as those who had a self-reported GPA of C or better and who gave no indication of academic reasons (failing or not doing well or courses too hard) for withdrawal on the survey questionnaire.

[B] Respondents were allowed to indicate more than one reason for withdrawing, so percentages may not be added.

In nonacademic withdrawals, vocational considerations appeared to influence two-year students more than they did four-year students; job offers and the desire to get practical experience more frequently became alternatives to two-year students. Financial difficulties and marriage more frequently caused dropout for four-year than two-year students, a rather surprising finding in light of the poor financial aid availability in two-year institutions (Table 6; Gladieux, 1975). Table 12 gives convincing evidence that adequate financial aid does increase the likelihood of college persistence for recipient students, particularly for minority students.

For those who withdrew due to academic reasons, a different pattern emerged, as a larger percentage of four-year students cited the desire to get practical experience as a reason for leaving, while thirty percent of the two-year students expressed the same reason. Not surprisingly, over 80% of both student groups cited failing grades or poor academic work as their reason for withdrawing.

Table 12. Total Withdrawal Rate[1] for Two-Year College Students[2] and Graduation Rate for Two-Year College Students by Financial Aid Status, Academic Ability, Race, Educational Aspirations, and Socioeconomic Status (SES): 1974

Student Characteristic	Total Withdrawal Rate[3]				Graduation Rate For Two-Year College Students	
	Four-Year College Students		Two-Year College Students			
	Aided	Not aided	Aided	Not aided	Aided	Not aided
	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	%	%
Ability:						
Low	37.0 (26.5)	53.4 (44.9)	53.1 (40.6)	63.3 (54.8)	11.0	4.1
Middle	26.0 (19.6)	35.1 (27.7)	39.3 (33.7)	47.8 (40.9)	21.3	11.7
High	14.4 (11.1)	21.6 (17.2)	18.6 (15.1)	43.2 (37.7)	31.3	16.2
Race:						
White	20.9 (15.6)	29.0 (22.5)	34.0 (25.5)	49.1 (42.4)	25.5	12.2
Black	24.4 (18.4)	46.2 (37.5)	43.5 (33.5)	67.1 (58.0)	11.0	4.1
Educational aspirations:						
Vocational-technical school	73.3 (53.0)	79.9 (66.3)	62.8 (48.4)	79.5 (69.9)	13.1	5.1
Two-year college	53.8 (45.3)	74.1 (51.8)	60.0 (44.4)	60.4 (51.7)	20.7	10.7
Four-year college	25.8 (19.9)	30.9 (25.2)	34.5 (29.3)	41.8 (35.5)	24.2	11.3
Graduate school	14.9 (10.9)	20.2 (15.0)	21.6 (16.0)	36.0 (30.8)	22.7	15.7
Socioeconomic status (SES):						
Low	30.8 (22.8)	52.6 (43.0)	46.7 (38.7)	64.3 (56.3)	15.8	6.4
Middle	22.6 (16.7)	37.5 (30.2)	34.5 (29.3)	55.1 (46.6)	25.0	10.4
High	14.4 (10.9)	22.2 (16.4)	25.0 (17.3)	38.6 (33.3)	22.6	13.8

[1] Percentage of those in a given enrollment and financial aid status, who have withdrawn.

[2] Includes those attending college in 1972 or 1973, but not in 1974.

[3] Includes those who withdrew for academic and nonacademic reasons. Figures in parentheses are nonacademic withdrawal rates; subtracting these figures from the ones preceeding them will give academic withdrawal rates for that subgroup.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 Edition, Table 3.14.

It is clear that persistence, ostensibly a simple activity, is actually a dynamic process involving transfer processes across and within institutional types, as well as stopping-out, or attendance on an intermittent basis. Table 11 shows re-entry data that form several patterns. First, students who stop-out and return are likely to return to the same type of institution, whether the original institution is a two-year or a senior college, and whether they left for academic or nonacademic reasons. Second, students who stop-out from senior institutions are more likely to return than are students who leave two-year institutions. Third, the type of student most likely to return after having left school is the student who

leaves a senior institution for a nonacademic reason. These findings suggest the importance of exit interviews with students who withdraw, so that the reasons for withdrawal can be identified and the students advised of reentry procedures.

Concentration upon re-entry patterns must not obscure the considerable wastage inherent in minority attrition. Solace cannot be taken in knowing that large numbers of majority students withdraw from college, for minority groups have not yet achieved equal opportunities and dropping out even at majority levels of attrition would cause smaller groups to fall farther behind. Nor can the promise of adult and continuing education, an increasing concern within postsecondary education, be expected to provide access for previously-excluded minority adults; data on participation in adult education show that minority enrollments in these courses have declined from 9% of the aggregate in 1969 to 8% in 1975 (Boaz, 1978). Therefore, unless major changes in minority adult education access occur, educators may not expect this sector of postsecondary education to provide learning alternatives for minorities.

As long as two-year colleges continue to be the major point of entry for minority students, retention in these institutions and transfer to senior institutions must be high priorities for policymakers concerned with equalizing opportunities. Astin has summarized intervention strategies aimed at involving students in institutional activities; unfortunately, many of the activities are nonexistent in commuter, non-residential institutions (including most public two-year colleges):

> If ways can be found to involve students more in the life and environment of the institution, their chances of staying in college are improved. A number of mechanisms are available to most institutions to bring about student participation: academic programs, admissions, freshman orientation, counseling and advisement, financial aid, work opportunities, extracurricular activities, and housing and student services (Astin, 1975b, p. 148).

Other writers, acknowledging the need to involve students in the institutional environment have suggested additional ways to impact upon students. These methods, some of which will be examined in more detail elsewhere, include reorganizing the administrative and governance structure to reduce incongruency between the students and their community (Alfred, 1975), diagnosing dropout proneness and advising students more competently than is presently done (Brawer, 1973), and concentrating more institutional resources upon comprehensive counseling and remedial instruction programs (Moore, 1970; 1976b).

Whether one views two-year institutions as tracking systems or as appropriate means of access, it is evident that public two-year colleges enroll the largest concentration of minority students. Further, whether one views college attrition as normal and healthy or as wastage, large numbers of minority students are withdrawing from college and not taking associate or baccalaureate degrees. The concentration of minority students in two-year institutions poses a set of questions beyond mere access. These questions include judgements concerning the extent of the access accorded minority students and judgements concerning practices that could improve the quality of education in the institutions presently according this access.

CHAPTER THREE

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Enrollment Patterns

Two-year college critics and supporters alike have suggested that minority students are channeled into vocational programs and away from academic transfer curricula. Karabel, for instance, has noted, "Black students show themselves to be considerably more likely than white students to enroll in community college vocational programs" (Karabel, 1972, p. 541). Referring to Chicano students, Barron (1973) indicated that they are " 'counseled' into what I refer to as a 'minority' curriculum—a vocational program" (p. 23). Gleazer (1973) likewise has noted the presumption that minority students are funnelled into the technical tracks (see especially Chapters 2 and 6). King (1977) has shown that Black high school students in college preparatory courses perceive that "vocational training is a device used by the white man to keep Blacks out of higher status jobs" (p. 439), and that their parents are more likely to encourage them to attend college than are parents of vocationally-enrolled high school students.

Indisputably, minority students comprise a disproportionately large share of total enrollments in these institutions, most of which have dual curricula: academic transfer and technical-vocational. While this concentration does alter traditional views of access for minority students, it is not the same as claiming that they are tracked within two-year institutions. Indeed, enrollment patterns in two-year colleges exhibit a semblance of equality and distribution not in evidence for minority students in other sectors of postsecondary education. Observers should not underestimate the severity of the minority concentration throughout the entire system, for a reasonable distribution in the lowest stratum of the system does not mean that the entire system has accorded access to minorities.

This point needs to be reiterated, lest this evidence of distribution within restricted access lull policymakers, however well-intentioned, into practices that would more negatively affect minorities at one end of the continuum. The data presented in the chapter should, then, be read with a major caveat in mind, namely, that they show limited progress and that they mask the skewing effect within the postsecondary universe. This chapter will examine two-year college enrollment patterns and minority student representation in area enrollments.

Consistent with earlier figures citing high minority attrition rates in two-year colleges, associate and sub-baccalaureate degree patterns* show that minority students receive fewer degrees than their proportional share in the two year college population; this becomes evident by comparing Tables 7 and 13.

---

*In 1975-76, 86.4% of the sub-baccalaureate degrees were awarded by two year colleges (Malitz, 1978, Table 8).

Table 13. Associate and Other Sub-Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded, By Race and Ethnicity, Gender, and Control of Institution, 1975-76

Student Gender and Institutional Control		Total	White	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Total Minority	Non-Resident
NCES [a]	No.	488,677	413,100	2,517	40,965	5,695	22,714	71,891	3,686
	%		84.5	.5	8.4	1.2	4.6	15.0	.8
Male	No.	256,782	219,019	1,298	19,163	3,003	11,838	35,302	2,461
	%		85.3	.5	7.5	1.2	4.6	14.0	1.0
Female	No.	231,895	194,081	1,219	21,802	2,692	10,876	36,589	1,225
	%		83.7	.5	9.4	1.2	4.7	16.0	.5
OCR [b,c]	No.	491,376	413,959	2,525	40,993	7,350	22,801	73,669	3,748
	%		84.2	.5	8.3	1.5	4.6	15.0	.8
Public	No.	432,543	364,652	2,313	35,881	6,975	20,155	65,155	2,567
	%	88.0	74.2	.5	7.3	1.4	4.1	13.3	.5
Private	No.	58,833	49,307	212	5,112	375	2,646	8,345	1,181
	%	12.0	10.0	0.0	1.0	0.1	.5	1.7	.2

[a] (NCES *The Condition of Education*, Table 3.17).

[b] Unpublished OCR data

[c] Calculations by ISEP staff.

Note: Data do not include U.S. Territories. NCES and OCR data report different totals. Hawaii was not included in OCR data; these data therefore undercount Asian degree recipients.

White students, who comprised 78.6 percent of two-year college students, took 84.2 percent of the associate degrees; American Indians, 1 percent of the two-year population, took .5 percent of the associate degrees; Blacks were 10.4 percent and took 8.3 percent; Asians were 2 percent and took 1.5 percent; Hispanics were 6.1 percent and took 4.6 percent. In all, minority students comprised 20.2 percent of the two-year population and received 15% of the sub-baccalaureate degrees. This slippage should be of concern to policymakers who believe problems of access have been solved by virtue of extensive minority enrollments in two-year colleges.

Because of sampling techniques and varying definitions of "transfer" and "technical" courses (or overlapping enrollments), it is impossible to define precisely even these categories. Moreover, for 1976, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) did not report its sub-baccalaureate data, although they were collected from the institutions. However, 1974 OCR data, shown in Table 14, indicate no major skewing of minority students into technical curricula, although minority enrollments in all but one category exceed their proportion of total two-year enrollments: whereas the 1974 minority percentage was 14.3% (OCR, 1974, Table 4), Business and Commerce Technologies were 16.1%; Data Processing Technologies, 20.9%; Health Services and Paramedical Technologies, 16.4%, Mechanical and Engineering Technologies, 19.2%; Natural Science Technologies, 6.7%, Public Service Related Technologies, 15.9%.

Table 14. Undergraduate Minority Enrollments in Sub-Baccalaureate Curricula, 1974

Enrollment	American Indian	Black	Asian American	Spanish-Surnamed Americans	Total Minority	All Other Students	Total
BUSINESS AND COMMERCE TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	1,462(0.7)	27,301(12.4)	1,677(0.8)	7,096(3.2)	37,536(17.1)	182,028(82.9)	219,564(100.0)
Female	957(0.8)	14,786(12.6)	1,001(0.9)	4,311(3.7)	21,055(17.9)	96,463(82.1)	117,518(100.0)
Male	505(0.5)	12,515(12.3)	676(0.7)	2,785(2.7)	16,481(16.2)	85,565(83.8)	102,046(100.0)
Part-time	781(0.5)	15,034(9.5)	1,607(1.0)	5,940(3.7)	23,362(14.7)	135,221(85.3)	158,583(100.0)
Female	477(0.6)	8,309(10.0)	878(1.1)	3,263(3.9)	12,927(15.5)	70,378(84.5)	83,305(100.0)
Male	304(0.4)	6,725(8.9)	729(1.0)	2,677(3.6)	10,435(13.9)	64,843(86.1)	75,278(100.0)
Total	**2,243(0.6)**	**42,335(11.2)**	**3,284(0.9)**	**13,036(3.4)**	**60,898(16.1)**	**317,249(83.9)**	**378,147(100.0)**
Female	**1,434(0.7)**	**23,095(11.5)**	**1,879(0.9)**	**7,574(3.8)**	**33,982(16.9)**	**166,841(83.1)**	**200,823(100.0)**
Male	**809(0.5)**	**19,240(10.9)**	**1,405(0.8)**	**5,462(3.1)**	**26,916(15.2)**	**150,408(84.8)**	**177,324(100.0)**
DATA PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	153(0.6)	3,928(16.1)	304(1.2)	1,021(4.2)	5,406(22.1)	19,059(77.9)	24,465(100.0)
Female	85(0.9)	1,795(18.5)	119(1.2)	381(3.9)	2,380(24.5)	7,316(75.5)	9,696(100.0)
Male	68(0.5)	2,133(14.4)	185(1.3)	640(4.3)	3,026(20.5)	11,743(79.5)	14,769(100.0)
Part-time	98(0.5)	2,746(13.4)	295(1.4)	854(4.2)	3,993(19.4)	16,543(80.6)	20,536(100.0)
Female	38(0.5)	1,284(16.3)	130(1.7)	253(3.2)	1,705(21.7)	6,150(78.3)	7,855(100.0)
Male	60(0.5)	1,462(11.5)	165(1.3)	601(4.7)	2,288(18.0)	10,393(82.0)	12,681(100.0)
Total	**251(0.6)**	**6,674(14.8)**	**599(1.3)**	**1,875(4.2)**	**9,399(20.9)**	**35,602(79.1)**	**45,001(100.0)**
Female	**123(0.7)**	**3,079(17.5)**	**249(1.4)**	**634(3.6)**	**4,085(23.3)**	**13,466(76.7)**	**17,551(100.0)**
Male	**128(0.5)**	**3,595(13.1)**	**350(1.3)**	**1,241(4.5)**	**5,314(19.4)**	**22,136(80.6)**	**27,450(100.0)**
HEALTH SERVICES AND PARAMEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	985(0.7)	14,547(10.8)	938(0.7)	3,848(2.8)	20,318(15.0)	114,938(85.0)	135,256(100.0)
Female	848(0.7)	12,047(10.6)	730(0.6)	2,861(2.5)	16,486(14.5)	97,463(85.5)	113,949(100.0)
Male	137(0.6)	2,500(11.7)	208(1.0)	987(4.6)	3,832(18.0)	17,475(82.0)	21,307(100.0)
Part-time	348(0.5)	10,051(14.2)	567(0.8)	2,557(3.6)	13,518(19.0)	57,460(81.0)	70,978(100.0)
Female	282(0.5)	8,687(14.6)	408(0.7)	1,993(3.3)	11,370(19.0)	48,330(81.0)	59,700(100.0)
Male	66(0.6)	1,364(12.1)	154(1.4)	564(5.0)	2,148(19.0)	9,130(81.0)	11,278(100.0)
Total	**1,333(0.6)**	**24,598(11.9)**	**1,500(0.7)**	**6,405(3.1)**	**33,836(16.4)**	**172,398(83.6)**	**206,234(100.0)**
Female	**1,130(0.7)**	**20,734(11.9)**	**1,138(0.7)**	**4,854(2.8)**	**27,856(16.0)**	**145,793(84.0)**	**173,649(100.0)**
Male	**203(0.6)**	**3,864(11.9)**	**362(1.1)**	**1,551(4.8)**	**5,980(18.4)**	**26,605(81.6)**	**32,585(100.0)**

MECHANICAL AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	1,824(1.1)	16,919(10.2)	1,676(1.0)	9,153(5.5)	29,572(17.8)	136,274(82.2)	165,846(100.0)
Female	96(1.1)	955(10.7)	231(2.6)	1,245(13.9)	2,527(28.2)	6,437(71.8)	8,959(100.0)
Male	1,728(1.1)	15,964(10.2)	1,445(0.9)	7,908(5.0)	27,045(17.2)	129,847(82.8)	156,887(100.0)
Part-time	749(0.6)	10,751(9.1)	1,829(1.6)	11,525(9.8)	24,854(21.1)	92,882(78.9)	117,736(100.0)
Female	104(0.8)	1,105(8.4)	526(4.0)	3,082(23.6)	4,817(36.8)	8,263(63.2)	13,080(100.0)
Male	645(0.6)	9,646(9.2)	1,303(1.2)	8,443(8.1)	20,037(19.1)	84,619(80.9)	104,656(100.0)
Total	**2,573(0.9)**	**27,670(9.8)**	**3,505(1.2)**	**20,678(7.3)**	**54,428(19.2)**	**229,156(80.8)**	**283,582(100.0)**
Female	**200(0.9)**	**2,060(9.3)**	**757(3.4)**	**4,327(19.6)**	**7,344(33.3)**	**14,895(66.7)**	**22,039(100.0)**
Male	**2,373(0.9)**	**25,610(9.8)**	**2,748(1.1)**	**16,351(6.3)**	**47,082(18.0)**	**214,461(82.0)**	**261,543(100.0)**
NATURAL SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	259(0.8)	1,111(3.3)	161(0.5)	417(1.2)	1,948(5.8)	31,518(94.2)	33,466(100.0)
Female	68(0.7)	533(5.4)	69(0.7)	114(1.2)	784(8.0)	9,051(92.0)	9,835(100.0)
Male	191(0.8)	578(2.4)	97(0.4)	303(1.3)	1,164(4.9)	22,467(95.1)	23,631(100.0)
Part-time	93(0.7)	724(5.8)	76(0.6)	226(1.8)	1,119(8.9)	11,471(91.1)	12,590(100.0)
Female	38(0.7)	454(8.0)	44(0.8)	111(2.0)	647(11.4)	5,024(88.6)	5,671(100.0)
Male	55(0.8)	270(3.9)	32(0.5)	115(1.7)	472(6.8)	6,447(93.2)	6,919(100.0)
Total	**352(0.8)**	**1,835(4.0)**	**237(0.5)**	**643(1.4)**	**3,067(6.7)**	**42,989(93.3)**	**46,056(100.0)**
Female	**106(0.7)**	**987(6.4)**	**113(0.7)**	**225(1.5)**	**1,431(9.2)**	**14,075(90.8)**	**15,506(100.0)**
Male	**246(0.8)**	**848(2.8)**	**124(0.4)**	**418(1.4)**	**1,636(5.4)**	**28,914(94.6)**	**30,550(100.0)**
PUBLIC SERVICE RELATED TECHNOLOGIES							
Full-time	506(0.7)	8,476(11.2)	335(0.4)	2,931(3.5)	12,248(16.1)	63,704(83.9)	75,957(100.0)
Female	242(0.8)	4,109(13.3)	144(0.5)	1,183(3.8)	5,678(18.4)	25,203(81.6)	30,881(100.0)
Male	264(0.6)	4,367(9.7)	191(0.4)	1,748(3.9)	6,570(14.6)	38,501(85.4)	45,071(100.0)
Part-time	487(0.6)	7,713(10.0)	524(0.7)	3,294(4.4)	12,118(15.8)	64,710(84.2)	76,928(100.0)
Female	287(0.9)	4,156(13.1)	286(0.9)	1,689(5.3)	6,418(20.3)	25,288(79.7)	31,684(100.0)
Male	200(0.4)	1,557(7.9)	238(0.5)	1,705(3.8)	5,700(12.6)	39,444(87.4)	45,144(100.0)
Total	**993(0.6)**	**16,189(10.6)**	**859(0.6)**	**6,325(4.1)**	**24,366(15.9)**	**128,414(84.1)**	**152,790(100.0)**
Female	**529(0.8)**	**8,265(13.2)**	**430(0.7)**	**2,872(4.6)**	**12,096(19.3)**	**50,469(80.7)**	**62,565(100.0)**
Male	**464(0.5)**	**7,924(8.8)**	**429(0.5)**	**3,453(3.8)**	**12,270(13.6)**	**77,945(86.4)**	**90,215(100.0)**

Source: *OCR Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data*, 1974, Table 12.

Associate degree programs do show highs (Data Processing) and lows (Natural Science), but there is evidence of a natural and reasonable "marketplace" occurring in two-year minority program enrollments, one somewhat at variance with minority baccalaureate enrollments. Severe overrepresentation of minority students in a certain few fields at the baccalaureate levels continues to pose a problem, as does the severe underenrollment of minority students in scientific fields and professional schools (Blake, Lambert, and Martin, 1974; Nwagbaraocha, 1974). Other studies of minority sub-baccalaureate enrollment patterns, reported elsewhere (Olivas, 1979), have also documented this apparent marketplace effect, although inconsistent reporting categories undoubtedly mask inconsistent figures and disproportionate enrollments within categories. Goodrich's data (1977), for example, indicate variations within larger groupings.

Case studies conducted for this Report did discover institutional evidence that is disturbing, if the practice is widespread. Given traditional assumptions concerning minority "tracking" into two-year vocational programs, presumptions requiring considerable qualification, it will undoubtedly surprise casual observers to discover that many two-year colleges have waiting lists and selective admissions policies that restrict the number of students admitted to certain vocational programs. In particular, allied health, nursing, and medical technician fields, with attendant laboratory and clinical components, have begun to attract many more applications than the institutions have openings (Morgan, 1977). Start-up costs, higher faculty salaries, and laboratory and equipment costs, as well as external accrediting and professional licensing guidelines, combine to make these programs expensive to initiate and maintain.

The increasing proportion of allied medical positions and excellent salaries for beginning technicians have attracted significant numbers of applications to the limited number of places. The increasing number of female students and tendency of women to seek careers in sub-baccalaureate allied medical and nursing programs have also increased the competition. Elsewhere it has been argued that selective admissions is not a phenomenon exclusive to senior institutions or graduate and professional schools (Morgan, 1977), and care must be taken by administrators not to employ naive numerical and exclusively quantitative means of judging applications.*

This fear was echoed by health care professionals and minority personnel interviewed in institutions with competitive admissions in technical and laboratory courses. In more than one instance, students with bachelor's degrees (and in two instances, advanced degrees) were applying to, and being accepted into, associate degree programs in allied health. There should be concern that this extreme example of educational inflation does not serve to exclude applications from persons whose highest educational aspiration and achievement will be the associate degree and certificate. Two-year colleges are in unique positions to meet pressing health care needs in ghettos, barrios, rural areas, and reservations; affirmative action and aggressive recruitment of minority applications need to be employed in order that they not be tracked *out* of consideration for such programs.

---

*The *Bakke* controlling opinion would probably find Morgan's admissions practices unconstitutional: "Thus 25 persons are chosen for the 28 openings. The remaining three positions are reserved for minority students. They do not compete with the other group; they compete only with each other. Their admission gives them more than 10 percent representation in the program" (Morgan, 1977, p. 69).

CHAPTER FOUR

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Faculty, Administrators, Trustees

FACULTY

Over twenty years ago, two scholars studying faculty characteristics noted, "Discrimination on the basis of race appears to be nearly absolute" (Caplow and McGee, 1958). More recent studies have concluded that socioeconomic status, ethnic group cultur and discrimination interact to produce the religious and ethnic composition of faculties. Ladd and Lipset (1975), for instance, have noted that, with the exception of high Jewish participation and increased Catholic (although not Latin American) representation, "little has happened to the American professoriate, in terms of its ethnic and religious makeup, in the years since World War II. There has been extraordinary growth, but the succeeding waves of newcomers closely resemble those who came before" (p. 2).

These researchers were referring to faculties in the entire spectrum of higher education, from open door colleges to the most elite universities. Upon realizing the extent to which minority students are enrolled in two-year colleges, an observer might imagine two-year faculties to be more integrated than are four-year faculties. However, while minority enrollments are disproportionately high in two-year colleges, minority faculty are disproportionately low in these institutions, both in the aggregate and even in those institutions that have become predominantly minority.

If one's expectations for increased minority faculty are raised by the realizations that few two-year college faculty hold the doctorate, that professional prestige in these institutions is the lowest in the hierarchy of American higher education, or that this sector continues to expand and provide teacher openings, these expectations will not be met, at least not if current trends are allowed to continue. Available two-year faculty data indicate that these institutions are no more representative, and in many cases, are less representative than are four-year institutions; available trend data show few gains and, instead, show erosion from previous levels in some instances. For instance, in the North Central region of the country (19 states), 96% of new full-time two-year faculty hired in 1973 were white (Brown, 1975), a record that would not even maintain present levels, much less increase the percentage of minority faculty.

The Carnegie Council report, *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education*, "did not receive data from enough two-year colleges to provide reliable information on the racial composition of their faculties" (CCPSHE, 1975, p. 29). However, several earlier studies, collected and reported in their entirety in *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges* (Olivas, 1979, Chapter 3), are summarized in Table 15. Despite the varying methodologies, the changing and non-comparable classifications, and the cultural and technical problems with racial/ethnic data-gathering, the studies appear remarkable in hovering about the 4-5% minority faculty level.

TABLE 15. Minority Faculty Percentage in Two-Year Institutions [a]

Study Author(s) and Year Conducted	All Institutions	Two-Year Institutions
Bayer, 1968-69	3.7	1.6
Goodrich et al., 1970	–	5.0
Bushnell, 1970	–	4.9
Goodrich, 1971	–	4.7
Bayer, 1972-73	5.2	3.9
Cohen and Brawer, 1975 *	–	5.9

[a] See (Olivas, 1979, Chapter 3) for complete citations and references.

* Humanities faculty only.

Additional studies have documented the underrepresentation of minorities in two-year colleges (Moore and Wagstaff, 1974; Moore, 1976a), the conservative nature of two-year faculties and faculties in less prestigious institutions (Ladd and Lipset, 1973; Cohen and Brawer, 1977; Schlesinger, 1979), and the inappropriateness of graduate training to meet the pedagogical and professional needs of most faculty who teach in two-year colleges (Martorana, Toombs, and Breneman, eds., 1975; Moore, 1976b). Universities may yet be training graduates to perform tasks not appropriate to the two-year college, but it is unclear just how college teachers can be trained in institutions that tend to de-emphasize the teaching task. Further, faculty development programs are well established in two-year colleges (Centra, 1978), a sign that a significant portion of the pedagogical training (as opposed to subject-matter training) is occurring under the auspices of two year institutions themselves.

These studies do not recommend ways in which universities, themselves overwhelmingly staffed by whites, can assist two-year colleges in increasing the proportion of minorities on faculties. Low minority baccalaureate and graduate enrollments have, in large part, resulted in fewer minority faculty available to teach in two-year institutions. Fewer minority faculty have thus assumed leadership positions in two-year colleges, where faculty experience is a common qualification. In turn, the paucity of minority administrators in all ranks has led to a small pool of minorities eligible for two-year college presidencies, where they could be in a position to initiate change and to create an organizational environment in which minorities receive equitable treatment and full opportunity. Also, as will be noted, there are few minorities who serve on boards of trustees, those bodies legally responsible for the administration of two-year colleges.

ADMINISTRATORS

As in the data previously discussed in the Faculty section, data on two-year administrators indicate that the ranks are disproportionately majority. Also, as before, the trend data indicate little progress in achieving minority representation, as measures appear to give evidence of retrenchment and maldistribution. The following tables, excerpted from the accompanying monograph (Olivas, 1979) display the racial/ethnic characteristics of specific two-year administrative positions:

Table 16. Employment Patterns by Educational Mission and Carnegie Classification, 1975-76 [a]

(White Administrators as Percentage of Whole)

	Research Universities (N=104)	Comprehensive Colleges (N=229)	Liberal Arts Colleges (N=211)	Two-Year Colleges (N=343)	Specialized Institutions (N=53)
All White Coeducational Institutions	**96.2**	**95.7**	**97.8**	**94.6**	**96.0**
Public White Coeducational Institutions	96.3	96.6	93.2	94.5	95.4
Private White Coeducational Institutions	95.9	97.7	98.2	98.0	96.3

[a] ISEP reanalysis of Van Alstyne et al., 1977a, Table 3. Male and female figures combined.

TABLE 17. Employment Patterns in Two-Year Colleges, 1975-76

Institutional Mission	N*	Male				Female			
		White		Minority		White		Minority	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All White Coeducational	343	3,539	78.6	185	4.1	728	16.2	52	1.1
Public White Coeducational	311	3,339	79.4	181	4.3	634	15.1	50	1.2
Public White Coeducational	32	200	66.7	4	1.3	94	31.3	2	0.7
All Women's Colleges	8	35	48.0	0	0.0	38	52.0	0	0.0
Public Women's Colleges	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0
Private Women's Colleges	8	34	48.0	0	0.0	38	52.0	0	0.0
All Men's Colleges	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0
Public Men's Colleges	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0
Private Men's Colleges	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0
All Minority Institutions	8	23	25.3	44	48.4	6	6.6	18	19.7
Public Minority Institutions	4	22	36.1	27	44.3	5	8.2	7	11.4
Private Minority Institutions	4	1	3.3	17	56.7	1	3.3	11	36.7

Source: Van Alstyne et al., 1977a, Table 3.

* Number in Pool.

Goodrich's 1971 data were collapsed to show aggregate administrative positions, indicating that minorities held slightly more than 6% of the line and staff positions. Van Alstyne's data show that in 1975-76, minorities had not made wide or deep gains. Public two-year colleges offered few administrative opportunities to minority men or women: 96.1% of the chief executive officers were white; 95.4% of the administrative affairs personnel were white; 96.7% of academic affairs personnel; 92.1% of student affairs personnel; and 93.7% of external affairs personnel. Additional analysis not reproduced in this Report indicates an internal clustering of affirmative action positions (EEO and personnel administration, etc.), and only the significant number of minority administrators performing these tasks has prevented additional losses in the aggregate (Van Alstyne *et al.*, 1977b, p. 41).

Even more dramatic losses would have been evident were it not for pressures of affirmative action to hire minorities and to establish ethnic studies components and administrative offices to coordinate minority affairs and ethnic data collection. It is cruelly ironic that the advocacy and establishment of minority-oriented administrative offices, and the relatively widespread adoption of such mechanisms for co-opting minority concerns, should mask the serious erosion of minority participation in the mainstream, central administrative ranks. Other researchers have noted this maldistribution (Moore and Wagstaff, 1974; Moore, 1976; Kronovet, 1977), and the resultant cycle of white administrators rising to leadership positions through the ranks.

Of course, this cycle is most clearly noted in Van Alstyne's (Table 17) and others' data (e.g., Brooks and Avila, 1974) on two-year college presidencies. Although there is no single listing of presidents and their ethnicity, Table 18 compiles formal and informal sources estimating that in 1978 there were 79 two-year college presidents who were members of minority groups: 38 Black, 21 Native American, 12 Mexican American, 6 Asian, and 2 Puerto Rican (on the mainland). The uncertainties of racial and ethnic data collection, the fledgling nature of tribal and other minority institutions, and lack of a comprehensive roster all make any such compendium tentative, but the list does give an informed estimate of the small extent to which minority administrators have achieved leadership positions in two-year colleges.

TABLE 18. Minority Chief Executive Officers in Two-Year Colleges, 1978 (estimated) [d]

	Number
Black	38
Native American	21
Mexican American	12
Asian American	6
Puerto Rican (Mainland)	2
Total	79

[d] Barry, ed., 1978; Gilbert, ed., 1979; Locke, ed., 1978; Moore, 1976b; Olivas, 1978. ISEP staff conversations with staffs of AACJC, American Indian Higher Education Consortium, El Congreso Nacional de Asuntos Colegiales, Council on Black American Affairs, Hispanic Higher Education Coalition.

Perceptions of minority progress hinge upon improvements over previous figures, historically at low levels, and upon access into relatively few two-year colleges. To the extent that minority housing patterns are largely metropolitan and central city (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978), one would expect a disproportionately high concentration of minority students in urban public institutions, if these institutions were serving their communities. In this regard, two-year institutions are in a "no-win" dilemma: as community-based service organizations, they must serve the community clientele, but if attendance patterns and school locations serve a segregated housing area, then those schools will tend to reflect those housing patterns. One two-year president has summarized this dilemma: "being accessible to the community, as opposed to mechanically promoting racial balance among adults attending the institution in non-compulsory education programs" (Middleton, 1978).

This dilemma, somewhat reminiscent of K-12 desegregation theories, must not lull policymakers or educators into inaction concerning access and distribution for minority students. Data previously analyzed indicate the concentration of students into one tier, and within this tier, into a very small number of schools.

Comprehensive analysis of two-year college presidents, or of additional administrative positions within two-year colleges, is beyond the scope of this Report. However, it should be increasingly clear that neither faculty ranks, lower administrative personnel, nor executive levels have adequate representation of racial and ethnic minorities. Further, because these actors serve as primary decision-makers in institutional policies, there is no nucleus for change in current levels of underrepresentation. The periods of growth in two-year institutions have not produced corollary growth in the percentage of minorities in positions of influence; there is considerable evidence that current levels are being eroded and that future representation will be even less evident. These layers of decision-making are critical for any understanding of personnel practices, particularly in any attempt to analyze underrepresentation of minority faculty, for if faculty do not appear to be favorably disposed towards minority hiring, and if the other decisionmakers are unenthusiastic, then it is unlikely that any evolutionary changes in faculty composition will occur. On the other hand, if decisions are made at points above the faculty, and if these decision-makers are favorably disposed towards redressing clearly demonstrable underrepresentation, then change may be more likely. Unhappily, two-year trustees appear to be as majority as are the faculty and administrators in their institutions.

TRUSTEES

The statistical literature on boards of trustees reinforces impressions formed from review of other decision-making levels in two-year colleges: despite high levels of minority enrollments in two-year institutions, few minority trustees have been elected or appointed to two-year boards. The figures in Tables 19 and 20 show only glacial rates of change over the last decade, when Black membership on boards averaged less than two percent (Hartnett, 1967). The electoral and appointive processes (half of public board members are elected, while half are appointed by governmental bodies [Drake, 1977, Table 6]) have failed to bring about significant change in board composition. In the private sector, significant numbers (an average of four seats per institution) remain unfilled at any time (Nelson and Turk, 1971, p. 3),* suggesting complacency in making more representative appointments.

*Discussions with AACJC staff indicated this number of vacancies has probably *increased* since the 1971 study.

Table 19. Characteristics of Voting Members of Single-Campus Governing Boards (in percentages)

Characteristics	Public Single-Campus Boards			Private Single-Campus Boards		
	University (N=27)	Four-Year (N=114)	Two-Year (N=491)	University (N=68)	Four-Year (N=1,217)	Two-Year (N=233)
Number of Voting Members:	**360**	**1,347**	**3,751**	**2,338**	**31,848**	**5,115**
Sex:						
Men	87.4	84.0	80.4	89.9	87.3	71.1
Women	12.6	16.0	19.6	10.1	12.7	28.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Race:						
Black	5.6	24.9	6.4	3.7	5.1	6.5
Other minority	2.0	2.2	3.0	.3	.8	.5
White	92.5	72.9	90.6	96.0	94.1	92.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: (Gomberg, and Atelsek, 1977, Table 8).

Table 20. Characteristics of Voting Members of Governing Boards (in percentages)[a]

Characteristic	Total Governing Boards				Public			Private	
	Total (N=2,314)	Single-Campus (N=2,150)	Multi-Campus (N=92)	Multi-Campus (N=72)	Single-Campus (N=632)	Multi-Campus (N=71)	Multi-Campus (N=67)	Single-Campus (N=1,518)	Multi-Campus (N=26)
Number of Voting Members:	47,138	44,759	1,368	1,011	5,458	609	846	39,301	
Sex:									
Men	84.9	84.9	85.8	85.2	81.7	84.9	84.1	85.3	87.3
Women	15.1	15.1	14.2	14.8	18.3	15.1	15.9	14.7	12.7
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Race:									
Black	6.0	5.9	4.5	8.7	10.9	6.7	9.7	5.2	2.9
Other minority	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.9	.7	.3
White	93.0	93.1	94.3	88.9	86.4	91.1	87.4	94.0	96.8
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

[a] (Gomberg and Atelsek, 1977, Table 3).

While these figures suggest minority two-year college trusteeship is approximately 8 percent—slightly higher than minority four-year college trusteeship—additional evidence suggests that four-year colleges are far more representative of the public. For instance, in a study of the composition of public single-campus governing boards, whites were only 72.9% in four-year colleges yet 90.6% in two-year colleges (Gomberg and Atelsek, 1977, Table 8). Because of the earlier-noted concentration of minority students in public two-year colleges, many of which are single-campus, this finding should be of concern. It appears indisputable that two-year college boards of trustees are representative neither of institutional minority students nor percentages of minorities in the public-at-large. Thus, the lag between theoretical representation of "community," by whatever reasonable standard one applies, and the actual practice is considerable.

CHAPTER FIVE

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Academic and Supportive Services

Predictably, higher education institutions have reacted in various ways and in varying degrees to non-traditional students, particularly in terms of academic programming and supportive services. Mingle has reported that the most striking institutional response to Black students in white institutions has been faculty negativism; he reported few for-credit or course option developments (Mingle, 1978). Cross (1976) has reported a significant increase in degree-credit basic skills coursework, although this increase was accompanied by a sharp decline in required remedial work. Snow (1977, in Grant and Hoeber, 1978) confirmed the trend toward lessening of basic skills requirements and expansion of degree basic skills credit. Morrison and Ferrante (1973), in surveying two-year colleges' responses to disadvantaged students, noted that 40% of the institutions provided curricular options designed specifically for these students; they did not distinguish between credit and non-credit offerings.

The response by two-year colleges has been similar to that by four-year colleges. The rise in remedial and developmental education programs parallels the increases in minority enrollments, but these increases clearly are not the sole cause or catalyst for such programs, for, increasingly, four-year and senior institutions with poor proportions of minority enrollments are turning to basic skills curricula and remedial programming (Roueche and Roueche, 1977), and white students do enroll in large numbers in two-year remedial courses (Ferrin, 1971). Accompanying the movement to mass higher education and increased access (if not distribution) is the perhaps inevitable concern over quality standards and institutional responses to this concern, manifested by curricular changes and remediation for even traditional and high ability students (Cross, 1976). Initiation of ethnic studies courses (Lombardi, 1971; Dutton, 1973; Locke, 1978) is a more likely and accurate race-specific index of institutional response to minority student clientele, although Roueche and Roueche (1977, p. 8) postulate cynically that such activity on the part of senior institutions marks less an increasing egalitarianism than an increasingly competitive market for students.

Nor is it conceded that two-year institutions perform remedial work more ably than do senior institutions, despite the concentration of minority students in two-year colleges. One critic has openly questioned the institutional commitment towards high-risk students:

> Another belief is that the best remedial programs for high-risk students are in two-year colleges. This is not necessarily the case. Though there are more community colleges which house remedial programs, the most effective and best-supported remediation programs are located in four-year colleges . . . and predominantly black four-year colleges . . . (Moore, 1975, p. 42).

Whatever the institutional motivations or target population, and whether in senior or junior institutions, remedial programming appears to have become firmly entrenched in postsecondary education.

These programs have included programs, courses, and services having both academic and support components. Researchers have noted a relationship between comprehensiveness of the curriculum and the existence of special programs, suggesting that broadly-designed curricula encompassing technical, transfer, and non-degree offerings are more likely to include remedial programs as formal components of the organization (Morrison, 1973; Roueche and Roueche, 1977). Programs include special guidance and counseling, tutoring, programmed instruction, and basic skills instruction in writing, reading, and mathematics (Moore, 1976b). Special courses have included precollege or summer introductions, degree-credit provisions for remedial work, ethnic studies courses, and incorporation of ethnic concerns into other classroom content (Dutton, 1973). The variety of services has included special arrangements for students to carry reduced course loads, pass/nonpass grading options, and special diagnostic testing for class placement (Cross, 1976).

The increasing heterogeneity of two-year institutions has brought not only new types of students, but has probably widened the continuum of traditionally-measured abilities as well. Choices of provisions for remedial work must, of course, be made to fit institutional characteristics and clientele. The choice to provide such services, however, must be made. It is a rare open door institution that can neglect remedial programming and lay claim to serving its community, however defined. The demonstrated need for such programs is coincidental with, but not entirely caused by, the rising minority enrollments in two-year institutions.

The role of remedial programs in assisting institutions to assemble representative student bodies should be clear. Less certain is the role of supportive services in providing counseling, inasmuch as other remedial functions cluster around academic and support services—tutoring, instructing, advising, even financing—which are attendant to academics, while counseling, at least theoretically, is affective and personal. There are approaches, including promising and successful programs (e.g., Garfield and McHugh, 1978), that combine instructional and guidance services for remedial students, but these appear to be rare. Visits to institutions, even minority institutions, gave indication of frequent bifurcation of counseling and academic programs, and frequent turf fights, even within comprehensive remedial programs.

Although some internal bifurcation is perhaps inevitable, the fragile nature of special programming cannot withstand frequent bloodletting. To be sure, larger programs serving multiple needs will develop problems of control and coordination, particularly if overall program funding is uncertain and vulnerable, or if institutional authorities are not fully supportive. But, other things being equal, larger comprehensive programs become more entrenched and are less likely to be eradicated than small, isolated program components without centralized control; a corollary is that special programs serving a disadvantaged clientele must move to traditional, mainstream sources of support and funding. No single model or program, however comprehensive, could hope to incorporate sufficient institutional detail to be generalizable to all two-year institutions, even those presently not serving minority community needs. However, institutional administrators and faculty can ensure that all such programs be given adequate support, especially in times of retrenchment, to perform the academic and supportive tasks not being completed in mainstream classroom instruction.

It could be argued that financial aid, or ability to pay for college costs, is a more fundamental threshhold barrier even than admissions policies or availability of remedial programs, academic or supportive, particularly for students of low-income families, a disproportionate number of whom are minority. Financial reasons for attrition have been found to be more common among minority students than among whites (Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1976), and visits to financial aid offices in minority institutions, particularly institutions that conducted exit interviews with students, confirmed that large numbers of students who drop out do so for financial reasons. Unfortunately, the recent passage of Proposition 13 in California, the heavy reliance of the state community colleges upon property taxes, and the concentration of minorities in the system may create a laboratory experiment for testing the effect of tuition upon college attendance of minorities.

State involvement in two-year college supportive services, however, save financial aid, has been minimal, particularly with regard to supportive services directed at minority student programming. The number of states funding programs designated for disadvantaged or minority students is small, and does not appear to be increasing. Table 21 lists the seven states that in 1975 and 1977 funded such programs:

TABLE 21. State Level Programs Designed for Disadvantaged/ Minority Students in Public and Private Higher Education Institutions, 1975 [a], 1977 [b,c]

1975 (7)*	1977 (7)
California	California
Connecticut	Connecticut
Maine	New Jersey
New Jersey	New York
New York	Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania	South Dakota
Wisconsin	Wisconsin

[a] (*Higher Education in the States*, 1975, pp. 1-24).

[b] (*Higher Education in the States*, 1977, pp. 1-28).

[c] Excludes need-based financial aid programs available to all students, and includes all self-designated disadvantaged/minority programs apart from need based financial aid programs.

* In December 1974, a Washington program and a tuition supplement plan were ruled unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court, due to State constitutional debt limitations and prohibitions on aid to sectarian colleges. The program has been restructured, with no special provisions for minority/disadvantaged students. (ISEP conversation with Council for Postsecondary Education Staff, August, 1978).

The programs include financial aid provisions explicitly designated for minority groups (e.g., Maine Indian and South Dakota Indian Student Scholarships) or disadvantaged target populations (e.g., Connecticut's 1977 grants "for potentially capable students whose educational achievement is restricted due to special, environmental or economic factors"). Specific support programs targeted at disadvantaged students include Connecticut's Talent Assistance Cooperative, designed to identify, recruit, counsel, and place "talented but disadvantaged high school students, dropouts, and noncontinuing high school graduates" and Pennsylvania's aid "to institutions for remedial programs for disadvantaged students." Clearly, patterns of state support will reflect a number of considerations, including institutional characteristics, state resources, population demographics, and legislative priorities.

As one would expect, California's state provisions for such special programming are the most comprehensive and funded at the highest level (total dollars, not per capita two-year college student). Since the initiation of the 1969 Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), the financial assistance and supportive services program serving the community college system (102 colleges) has grown from nearly $3 million to almost $14 million. In 1977, nearly 50,000 students (39% of the target disadvantaged population) received financial aid, tutoring, counseling, or special instruction through EOPS (Morales, 1977, Tables 2, 3, 4).

Case studies in California, conducted shortly after the passage of Proposition 13, revealed considerable concern over the fate of such line items in the state budget. Because the programs are need-based, over two-thirds of the students served are minority, while 86% of the campus EOPS directors are minority (Farland et al., 1976, Table 3). Both EOPS personnel and college administrators feared that such programming would be viewed as unimportant and unnecessary by legislators unless the "seed money" nature of special legislation was stressed. Ninety-six percent of the EOPS directors had received supplemental funding (Farland et al., 1976, Table 28) from additional sources, indicating the extent to which state money has enabled the colleges to seek extramural program support. (See also Brossman, 1974; Morales, 1977.) Visits to two-year colleges in other states administering special programming confirmed that the state subsidies enabled personnel to seek federal, other governmental, and private money available for program development and evaluation.

Portions of special program funding frequently went for start-up and admissions costs, understated but exceptionally important components of programs for disadvantaged student clientele (see, for example, H. Astin *et al.*, 1972, pp. 303-317). In a time when senior institutions are employing sophisticated marketing techniques (Leister, 1975; Leister and MacLachlan, 1976) and recruiting increasing numbers of students who might attend two year colleges, admissions officers in two-year institutions may expect their role to increase in significance, for several trends point to an increasing reliance upon admissions criteria and a need for increasing enrollments, both unfamiliar activities for open door institutions.

The aforementioned increased competition for technical and career program admissions has already begun to require administrative procedures and collegial judgements concerning selection (Morgan, 1977), although it is not clear the extent to which admissions officers will play a role in judgements concerning program applications. Despite the lower levels of collegiality in two-year facilities (Baldridge et al., 1978) there is every reason to believe selected program admissions will likely be made by technical and career program faculty and departmental heads. Nevertheless, admissions staff members, or departmental administrators and unit staff members, play a formal role in disseminating

application materials, assembling applications, and explaining procedures to students; similarly, they play an informal role in the preparation of dossiers and presentation of materials to faculty or admissions committees.

This detailed explanation serves as a reminder of the administrative discretion accorded faculty and staff in making judgements, particularly in competitive admissions procedures. While the anticipated need to recruit students into enrollment-driven and FTE-funded institutions will require different skills and judgements, admissions of minority students into two-year colleges will require no less sensitivity on the part of admissions personnel. The Van Alstyne, et al., (1977) study of staffing patterns showed that 93% of two-year admissions officers were white and 91% were white men. Institutions, including two-year institutions, would do well to examine staffing patterns to see if the minority communities are being reached adequately by present personnel, and if admissions and recruitment activities are effectively reaching minority community and institutional needs.

The importance of identification, recruitment, and admissions is clear in comprehensive support services, where such initiating activities appear commonplace. Additional support elements include various advising or counseling services (personal, diagnostic, vocational, and academic), student affairs programming (student activities, residential programs, and cultural programs), and technical or administrative services (registration, financial aid assistance, veterans assistance). These support programs, particularly advising and technical services, are essential if the commuter nature of two-year colleges is to be maintained, for non-residential or part-time students must be able to negotiate the administrative systems even more efficiently than do resident or full-time students. Extensive student activities programs are less evident in two-year than in four-year institutions, for fewer public two-year colleges have dormitory facilities and the attendant residential programs available at private two year colleges or at public or private baccalaureate institutions (Halstead, 1974, p. 420; Astin, King, Richardson, 1976, p. 20).

Despite general underutilization of available federal financial aid provisions by two-year colleges (Gladieux, 1975), a significant number of institutions have coordinated or incorporated financial aid counseling, screening, or program administration with remedial services administration: Cross (1976, p. 194) reported that 59% of her sample institutions had federally funded financial aid programs for disadvantaged students, while over 90% of Morrison's (1973, p. 409) institutions had such programs. For informational purposes, if not administrative reasons, it is essential that coordination between financial aid officers and remedial/supportive services personnel be maintained. Developmental programs and ethnic studies programs should be involved in this, and in other supportive services, in order that administrative procedures for students (and their parents) be minimized and facilitated. For example, translation of financial aid forms into languages other than English (or, perhaps more frequently, English into understandable English) could be a regular and essential cooperative activity between bilingual administrators, students, and parents; such services become especially necessary when the students are first-generation college goers and parental income information is required. While need-based programs of financial aid will continue to distribute large sums of money to minority students, a large problem remains in matching student needs with available funds. Most students receive inadequate or limited information, but this is particularly a problem within minority communities, who do not have the formal mechanisms available to disseminate and receive technical program information. Therefore, comprehensive programs of financial aid information should be undertaken as a regular component of recruitment and admissions; these programs should employ available minority media and informal information networks.

Discussions of financial aid are often inaccurately equated with provisions solely for tuition and fees. Gladieux has hypothesized that neglect of other educational expenses, chiefly housing and eating costs, accounts for some of the disproportionately low receipt of financial aid funds by two-year institutions (1975, pp. 2-3). Even excluding foregone wages, a major consideration for part-time students in two-year institutions, there are costs incurred by commuters for which no financial aid provisions are intended. That this is so for two-year students is due to the primarily-commuter nature of the institutions.

But the commuter nature of two-year colleges presents other problems for educators besides the financial aid provisions. Most notably, there are negative implications for retention, socialization, and campus employment stemming from the lack of dormitories in two-year colleges. It will be recalled that few public two-year colleges are residential, although research findings almost unanimously agree that residential living increases the likelihood that students will stay in college (e.g., Richardson, 1956; Stark, 1965; Feldman and Newcomb, 1973, pp. 196-226; Chickering, 1974; Astin, 1975b; Astin, 1977a). While the phenomena of retention are extraordinarily complex, it is clear that opportunities for campus-based social interaction, informal socialization, and free time are reduced when students live off campus. While these opportunities may be of secondary interest or importance to two-year (or four-year) students, and while part-time or older students may be developing such opportunities apart from campus, the not inconsiderable numbers of full-time two-year students (including minority students) may unwittingly deny themselves social and informal reinforcement of their academic development by attending these institutions.

Of course, many commuter institutions (two and four-year) have developed large, comprehensive student affairs programming, mitigating somewhat the lack of social interaction opportunities. These programs may enable students to become involved in organizations and to develop leadership skills normally afforded students in residential institutions, and they may even generate work-study or other employment opportunities similar to those in dormitories and other campus housing, but the time spent in social interaction is obviously less than it is in residential living, and the opportunities for institutionalized programs are similarly reduced.

It may be politically impossible for two-year colleges, particularly in times of retrenchment or no-construction phases, to reconcile their accessibility to commuters and part-timers with demonstrable needs of residential students. Inasmuch as the former constituencies are less expensive to serve, their needs have superseded those of residential students (or students who would be residential if the institutions provided housing). If construction of dormitories is unwise or impossible, then two-year college administrators could, at the least, seek to provide adequate surrogates for residential programs, including ones that will involve students and institutional personnel. Further, increasing involvement with the community by students and staff would tend to enlarge the impact of the institution upon the community, including students within the community.

As with academic programs and supportive services designed for remedial students, the more successful supportive programs appear to be comprehensive, cooperative efforts at involving institutional staff (H. Astin et al., 1972; Garfield and McHugh, 1978) and students (Reed, 1973) in the process. These efforts are aimed at providing for student needs, and, if performed by sensitive, competent staff, would theoretically assist retention for minority and majority students (Astin, 1975b). This concept, that integrated and comprehensive support services will assist many constituencies, should make such programs more important to policymakers. Surely, faculty will support efforts to assist students, but this support should be participatory, and efforts at remediation should not be sloughed off onto supportive service components alone.

CHAPTER SIX

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: Data Issues

The use to which educational statistics are put constitutes a significant policy arena in itself, one no less subject to political considerations or manipulation by advocates than are more traditionally-acknowledged policy arenas, such as public works projects or congressional redistricting. Indeed, because of the peculiar nature of educational statistics—and their malleability for those who would employ them to their own purposes—educational statistics and attendant data issues in and of themselves are appropriate concerns necessitating analysis. Therefore, this chapter will consider several of these technical, conceptual, and political issues concerning racial and ethnic educational data: Chapter One includes several specific recommendations aimed at improving the collection and utility of such data.

Major data sources of statistics on two-year college enrollments are the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), both administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC); and the American College Testing Program (ACT, or the Parker survey). Those federal and state agencies and private associations that conduct higher education surveys do so for varying and sometimes conflicting purposes. Federal and state agencies request from institutions, at varying times, racial and ethnic data for employment records, financial aid programs, construction and housing contract applications, court-ordered affirmative action or desegregation compliance, and for other program or contract purposes. Some federal data collectors make requests for purposes primarily related to education; for others, education itself is a secondary concern, significant only in its impact upon another governmental concern. In these cases, knowledge of educational data make their understanding, and the understanding of other specified phenomena, easier and fuller.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) derives its responsibility for collecting higher education statistics from its multiple missions to fund programs, institutions, and students. Aggregate surveys of institutional data conducted by the two DHEW authorities, OCR and NCES, could accurately be termed quality or oversight control mechanisms for monitoring its funded constituencies; these compilations also serve legislative data functions and as primary data bases for a host of governmental and private sector uses. OCR collects racial and ethnic postsecondary enrollment data on a biennial

basis, monitoring all institutions receiving federal financial assistance to determine their continued eligibility for these funds. NCES, as a primary annual data source, gathers and disseminates data related to enrollment and other related aspects of higher education. Secondarily, through annual digests, NCES compiles current data from other sources and, through occasional papers, sponsors research from its own and other data bases.*

Education, and educational statistics, also influence significantly other national concerns. The Bureau of the Census, in monitoring the economic and demographic condition of the country, surveys the population for educational attainment and enrollment statistics.** These data have relevance for the Commerce Department inasmuch as educational attainment impacts appreciably upon economic growth, the labor force, and other economic indicators; higher education is, in this context, a commodity or commercial enterprise. The Census Bureau data also have racial and ethnic implications for political redistricting, revenue sharing, and similar demographically-determined formula programs.

Major privately-funded collections of two year enrollment data include those of AACJC and ACT. Although neither's instrument is minority-sensitive, the annual statistics are widely recognized and utilized by policymakers. The AACJC survey is more than a membership roster, and attempts to include all sub-baccalaureate institutions, most, although not all, of which are affiliates of the association. The ACT survey, annually conducted by Garland Parker, tends to sacrifice accuracy for timeliness, as its avowed purpose is "to collect, report, and interpret American two-year college enrollment data as early in the academic year as possible and release a preview of these findings in early press releases . . . ." This leads to considerable variation between preliminary and final figures, and between ACT and NCES figures in final form.*** Nevertheless, for defining sub-groups and constituency groupings, private and association enrollment data sources continue to indicate the diversity within postsecondary education.

What these surveys mean to institutions, however, is that several major data requests must be completed each year, requiring considerable time. Much of what is being collected by various survey instruments overlaps, while persons responsible for completing these forms have conflicting perceptions of each survey's purposes. There is a strong tendency to perceive racial and ethnic data requests as needlessly repetitive while undue delays between the time of gathering and publishing data may lead institutions to question the

---

*"The purpose of the Center shall be to collect and disseminate statistics and other data related to education in the United States and in other nations. The Center shall . . . collect, collate, and, from time to time, report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; [and] conduct and publish reports on specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics . . . . " (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1)

**See Hernandez *et al.* (1973) and Abramowitz, ed. (1976), for analyses of conceptual and political issues concerning racial and ethnic data, including Census Bureau data.

***Compare *Higher Education Daily*, 6 April 1978, with Parker, 1978; and *Higher Education Daily*, 27 October 1978 with *Higher Education Daily*, 5 January 1979.

data's usefulness. Moreover, not all gathered data, even important data, are published. * Finally, several federal and state efforts to streamline paperwork have deleted racial and ethnic data requirements in programs, frequently causing uneven data collation practices within the same institution. For example, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has recommended that TRIO programs not maintain racial or income data files, a policy somewhat at odds with the avowed legislative purpose of the programs design to deliver services to disadvantaged students, most of whom are minorities. Chapter One contains several recommendations aimed at consolidating data collection efforts.

In addition to the diverse and sometimes conflicting reasons for gathering enrollment data, there are the more complex conceptual and operational problems of acquisition and enumeration. Most postsecondary enrollment data are collected either by institutional survey, e.g., OCR, NCES, ACT, AACJC, or by querying informants, e.g., Census Bureau, Current Population Surveys (CPS). A survey's purpose, whether of primary or secondary educational interest, requires differences in sampling procedures. Conceptualization of the universe to be sampled, delineation of the sample, and application of appropriate statistical controls to the sample for making inferences are crucial elements of the data collection process for policy analysts as the accuracy of this process renders the data more or less useful. All data sources define their universes to be sampled differently, in terms of institutional categories and student characteristics. Just how representative the sample will be for generalizability is dependent on how the universe from which it is to be drawn is defined. OCR, NCES, and AACJC, for instance, define more narrowly and clearly their two-year universe than ACT or the Census Bureau: those surveyors that chose a broader universe include many different types of postsecondary institutions and students. Garland Parker's survey includes all schools that fall under the two-year rubric, while institutional size and category are not clear, and this makes his survey results appear less conceptually clear as to which universe he is defining. The results derived from using these samples cannot be weighted as the universe is unclear and those who would use these data for higher education enrollment analysis cannot tell which part of the two-year universe the estimates most accurately describe. It is especialy important when analyzing racial/ethnic enrollments that the universe be conceptually clear as failure to do so distorts the picture of minority participation in postsecondary education.

There are additional definitional problems inherent in categorizing ethnic institutions, particularly Black institutions, problems that have conceptual and political roots. Thus, Black institutions have been variously described as "historically-Black," "traditionally-Black," and "newer predominantly-Black." **On the surface, these classifications would appear to have little relevance to data issues, except that many surveys (e.g., ACE's annual Freshman Profiles) disaggregate Black enrollments by institutional type, necessitating a clear understanding of the categories into which the racial data are disaggregated.

---

* The 1976 OCR postsecondary racial/ethnic data, for example, do not list all baccalaureate enrollments or any sub-baccalaureate enrollments. The data had been published in the 1974 book, and were collected for 1976.

**See, for example, NACBHEBCU (1978) and Turner and Michael (1978) for discussions of definitional issues concerning Black institutions. Appendix V of this report notes the difficulty in defining "Indian" institutions.

Definitional problems also exist in utilizing sampled data for measuring educational attainment. In addition to the statistical difficulties encountered in sampling minority populations, which may reveal the enumerator's unfamiliarity with the respondents' language or culture, there are understandable possibilities of error concerning educational definitions. Two such examples are the failure of Census or Current Population Survey (CPS) questionnaires to distinguish between collegiate and proprietary enrollments and, for collegiate enrollees, to distinguish between transfer or technical coursework. The assumption of these questionnaires is that household informants possess accurate information regarding the institutional type attended by and status of a family member enrolled in postsecondary education. There may also be a tendency for uninformed family members to inflate their family's educational attainment.

Thus far, this catalog of potential errors has been limited to technical and conceptual problems confined to the gathering of racial and ethnic data. Another major category of data error include reporting errors, or problems associated with actually disseminating gathered data. NCES data, for example, are cited differently for the same period by NCES reports. The *1977 Condition of Education* reports fall 1974 and fall 1975 total enrollments in two-year institutions as 3,312,000 and 3,871,000 respectively while the *1978 Condition of Education* reports these enrollments for the same two years as 3,404,000 and 3,970,000 respectively.* Such discrepancies make it very difficult for policymakers or researchers to validate the accuracy of these statistics without purchasing the tapes and making expensive computer runs.

For all the difficulties facing those who would use existing data, the most problematic issue may be the need for data not yet collected. Missing data seem a minor problem when contrasted with the major difficulties already detailed for collected and reported data and yet major gaps exist for those who would make informed judgements on higher education policy. Some of these problems of omission have been alluded to, as in the OMB requirements for TRIO to delete record keeping by racial and income categories.** One NCES project to recommend statistical needs suggested the following large categories of missing data: equal educational opportunity, equal choice, retention, personnel needs, recurrent education, and educational diversity (Christoffel and Rice, 1975). The collected but unpublished data, already noted, are also a gap. Thus, ironically, researchers and policymakers are faced with too much and too little data, including large amounts of data of questionable utility and large amounts of potentially useful data not being collected. Throughout the earlier chapters, this irony has been explored, as inadequate data and data needs were noted.

*Compare Tables 3.03 (*Condition of Education*, 1977) and 3.4 (*Condition of Education*, 1978).

**Such streamlining is occurring in the private sector as well, even in private organizations that continue to collect racial and ethnic data. The National Research Council, for instance, has combined its disaggregated Hispanic doctoral data into one "Hispanic" category, ignoring the NBGE (1976) recommendations that NRC maintain disaggregated data on doctorates.

While the most obvious starting point for a coherent racial data policy is the federal level, an equally important focus for implementing changes is the states, which coordinate or govern most institutional planning policies. However, an ISEP survey of state data policies revealed that few states have taken initiatives to coordinate racial and ethnic data practices so as to streamline collection procedures or to consolidate dissemination of collected data. Of particular interest was how few state agencies responsible for higher education planning, thereby having vested interests in accurate and comprehensive data, maintained racial and ethnic data records. Of the forty-nine responding commissions, only twenty (41%) collect and analyze racial and ethnic institutional data.*

Most state boards collect data for purposes of planning, review of enrollment trends, or legislative (or agency) oversight; several states, notably those involved in civil rights ligigation, do so in compliance with court-ordered mandates to monitor equal access. Few commissions maintain staff whose sole responsibilities are to gather and compile institutional data, although several who have not invested in full-time staff have apportioned responsibilities to several administrators in order that comprehensive data are coordinated and made available to those who would seek such data. In Illinois, for example, the *Data Book on Illinois Higher Education* is maintained to "minimize the reporting burden on the institutions." Similarly, other states have employed standing committees or directed mail systems to reduce duplication of already existing information and to assign requests for information. This centralization of data further helps reduce the institutional burden by facilitating responses to many research and public information requests.

Inasmuch as all respondent states collect student and institutional characteristics, the failure of some agencies to analyze racial and ethnic data suggests some indifference to minority needs. In many instances, it would only require minor modifications in existing survey designs to accomodate analyses of race and ethnicity for items already being measured. More surprisingly, several states had not even collated institutional data already collected by OCR and Higher Education General Information Service (HEGIS); these states apparently remain unaware of the potential usefulness to themselves of the data the individual institutions are required to collect. The existing federal requirements provide states with an adequate base or starting point for racial and ethnic analyses, and it remains surprising that such important planning tasks continue to be performed perfunctorily or not at all.

*Questionnaires were sent to all 1202 commissions or, in states without designated planning (1202) commissions, to the state coordinating or governing agency. Only Rhode Island did not respond to the survey.

Appendix A. Selected Statistics for the 60 Colleges and University Campuses Enrolling the Largest Numbers of Students: United States, Fall 1975

Institution	Rank order[1]	Control[2]	Type[3]	Total enrollment[4]	Enrollment by sex		Enrollment by attendance status	
					Men	Women	Full-time	Part-time
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-Saint Paul	1	1	U	66,887	35,717	30,170	39,276	27,611
University of California, Los Angeles	2	1	U	60,127	31,836	28,291	31,687	28,240
Ohio State University, Main Campus	3	1	U	50,146	29,356	20,790	43,972	6,174
Michigan State University	4	1	U	48,488	25,726	22,762	37,217	11,271
University of Texas at Austin	5	1	U	45,429	26,249	19,180	37,882	7,547
Pennsylvania State University, Main Campus	6	1	U	40,102	22,719	17,383	29,639	10,463
University of Wisconsin, Madison	7	1	U	38,603	22,138	16,465	32,718	5,885
Wayne State University, Michigan	8	1	U	38,073	22,388	15,685	25,856	12,217
Miami-Dade Community College, Florida	9	1	T	37,669	19,478	18,191	19,521	18,148
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	10	1	U	37,505	22,017	15,488	31,286	6,219
Arizona State University	11	1	U	36,976	20,822	16,154	21,577	15,399
University of Illinois, Urbana Campus	12	1	U	36,845	22,459	14,385	31,678	5,167
University of Maryland, College Park Campus	13	1	U	35,995	19,526	16,469	26,882	9,113
University of Washington	14	1	U	35,972	20,609	15,363	28,122	7,850
Northeastern University, Massachusetts	15	2	U	35,970	22,904	13,066	16,080	19,890
University of Houston, Main Campus, Texas	16	1	U	35,419	21,191	14,228	19,722	15,697
Temple University, Pennsylvania	17	1	U	34,950	19,681	15,269	16,182	16,768
University of Cincinnati, Main Campus, Ohio	18	1	U	34,885	20,995	13,889	20,522	14,363
San Diego State University, California	19	1	F	34,835	18,564	16,271	19,695	15,140
University of California, Berkeley	20	1	U	34,809	21,372	13,437	28,020	6,789
City University of New York, Brooklyn College	21	1	F	34,497	15,690	18,807	19,999	14,498
California State University, Long Beach	22	1	F	34,427	18,290	16,137	16,954	17,473
Indiana University at Bloomington	23	1	U	32,651	18,266	14,385	27,509	5,142
Long Beach City College, California	24	1	T	32,241	16,520	15,721	6,876	25,365
San Jose State University, California	25	1	F	31,783	16,163	15,620	15,397	16,386
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.	26	1	U	30,993	16,545	14,448	20,542	10,451
Orange Coast College, California	27	1	T	30,842	15,566	15,276	7,286	23,556
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	28	1	U	29,999	17,179	12,820	22,888	7,111
University of Pittsburgh, Main Campus, Penn.	29	1	U	29,729	16,762	12,967	17,316	12,413
New York University	30	2	U	29,698	15,890	13,808	13,625	16,073
El Camino College, California	31	1	T	29,457	15,355	14,102	7,495	21,962
Purdue University, Main Campus, Indiana	32	1	U	29,335	18,155	11,180	25,564	3,771
University of Arizona	33	1	U	29,149	16,104	13,045	21,227	7,922
University of Florida	34	1	U	28,830	17,911	10,919	23,545	5,285
California State University, Northridge	35	1	F	28,735	14,389	14,346	15,036	13,699
University of Southern California	36	2	U	28,074	19,115	8,959	16,602	11,272
City University of New York, Queens College	37	1	F	28,057	12,089	15,968	15,681	12,376
Brigham Young Univ., Main Campus, Utah	38	2	U	27,218	13,976	13,242	21,726	5,492
Northern Virginia Community College	39	1	T	27,198	13,681	13,517	8,079	19,119
University of Missouri-Columbia	40	1	U	26,190	15,340	10,850	21,624	4,566
University of Virginia[5]	41	1	U	26,018	12,853	13,165	14,066	11,952
City College of San Francisco, California	42	1	T	25,975	13,051	12,924	11,662	14,313
California State University, Los Angeles	43	1	F	25,962	13,694	12,268	11,238	14,724
University of Massachusetts, Amherst Campus	44	1	U	25,884	14,768	11,116	22,724	3,160
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge	45	1	U	25,617	14,589	11,028	20,527	5,090
San Francisco State University, California	46	1	F	25,485	12,027	13,458	13,605	11,879
Northern Illinois University	47	1	U	24,984	12,578	12,366	15,411	9,553
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	48	1	F	24,961	13,486	11,475	14,837	10,124
University of South Carolina, Main Campus	49	1	U	24,923	13,579	11,344	16,862	8,061
Texas A&M University, Main Campus	50	1	U	24,915	17,782	7,133	21,753	3,162
Boston University, Massachusetts	51	2	U	24,292	12,148	12,144	16,624	7,668
Los Angeles Valley College, California	52	1	T	24,167	12,206	11,961	8,074	16,093
State Univ. of N.Y. at Buffalo, Main Campus	53	1	U	24,025	14,696	9,329	17,424	6,601
University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus	54	1	U	23,995	15,006	8,989	15,988	8,007
University of Utah	55	1	U	23,978	15,354	8,624	17,520	6,458
Charles S. Mott Community College, Michigan	56	1	T	23,922	10,106	13,816	4,854	19,068
Los Angeles City College, California	57	1	T	23,904	13,452	10,452	8,694	15,210
Los Angeles Pierce College, California	58	1	T	23,798	12,822	10,976	8,843	14,955
City University of New York, Hunter College	59	1	F	23,584	6,170	17,414	9,447	14,137
Western Michigan University	60	1	F	23,238	12,263	10,975	15,105	8,133

[1] Institutions ranked by size of total enrollment.

[2] Publicly controlled institutions are identified by a "1", privately controlled by a "2".

[3] The types of institutions are identified as follows: "U"—universities, "F"—other four year institutions, "T"—two year institutions.

[4] Includes resident and extension students whose programs of study are creditable toward a bachelor's or higher degree and also undergraduate students in 1-, 2-, or 3-year occupational programs which are not chiefly creditable toward a bachelor's degree.

[5] Data are for main campus and School of Continuing Education.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1976, Table 81.

Appendix B. Concentration of Minorities in Two-Year Colleges

Institution	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total Enrollment	Location**
Alabama							
Lawson State College*	0.0	98.8	0.0	0.0	0.2	1,331	U
Lomax-Hannon Junior College *	0.0	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	126	R
SD Bishop State Junior College*	0.1	88.0	0.1	0.1	8.3	1,523	U
Alabama Lutheran*	0.0	94.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	137	U
Arizona							
Central Arizona College	7.5	2.8	0.1	16.7	72.9	5,330	U
Cochise College	0.9	4.2	1.7	18.3	73.3	3,676	R
College of Ganado	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.5	202	R
Eastern Arizona College	9.1	1.9	0.6	18.7	69.7	3,127	R
Maricopa Technical Community College	3.2	12.3	0.6	17.0	66.9	5,628	U
Phoenix College	2.0	3.9	0.9	9.5	83.1	13,617	U
Navajo Community College	90.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	9.6	917	R
Pima Community College	2.2	4.6	0.7	18.2	72.6	15,638	U
Arkansas							
Shorter College *	0.0	95.0	1.5	0.0	3.0	199	U
California							
Allan Hancock College	1.4	7.0	3.1	9.7	78.9	7,479	U
Bakersfield College	1.7	6.4	2.2	14.7	74.7	11,091	U
Cerritos College	1.3	3.8	1.9	15.5	70.4	12,462	U
Chabot College	1.1	5.9	5.0	7.4	80.3	18,293	U
Chaffey College	0.7	3.0	0.6	13.4	81.2	9,673	S
Citrus College	1.0	3.8	1.5	11.4	82.4	7,529	S
Coast Community College-Golden West	1.1	0.7	3.8	3.4	91.1	17,829	S
Coast Community College-Orange Coast	1.1	0.5	2.4	3.6	91.9	15,083	U
Coastline Community College	1.7	0.9	4.7	4.7	88.0	14,872	S
College of the Desert	0.8	3.2	1.2	12.7	81.8	4,797	R
College of the Sequoias	0.8	2.6	1.5	17.4	74.8	5,895	R
Compton Community College	0.2	85.9	1.3	3.8	5.8	6,016	U
Contra Costa Com. College-Diablo Valley	0.6	2.2	1.6	2.9	92.3	18,991	S
Contra Costa Com. College-Los Medanos	1.2	9.5	1.6	10.2	77.3	5,046	S
D-QU	52.6	0.7	0.0	30.9	15.8	152	R
El Camino College	1.4	13.5	5.6	5.6	74.0	28,454	U
Foothill-DeAnza Com. College-DeAnza	14.9	3.8	5.1	5.7	70.1	16,313	S
Fullerton College	0.9	1.2	1.6	9.4	86.7	16,910	S
Glendale Community College	1.0	0.5	4.0	10.5	79.0	6,469	U
Hartnell College	2.4	4.1	9.4	20.1	64.0	5,777	U
Imperial Valley College	1.1	4.3	1.1	45.2	47.1	4,001	R
Long Beach City College	1.2	9.8	4.3	6.6	77.3	31,065	U
East Los Angeles College	1.1	6.2	8.8	60.8	19.1	17,613	U
LA City College	1.5	39.2	13.5	14.3	25.3	21,302	U
LA Harbor College	2.1	13.8	10.8	14.1	55.8	11,137	U
LA Mission College	2.1	13.2	1.8	32.3	48.4	2,721	S
LA Southwest College	0.3	91.8	0.8	0.4	1.0	5,609	U
LA Trade and Technical College	1.7	42.7	7.8	18.6	23.7	17,904	U
LA Valley College	2.6	4.5	3.8	10.7	75.4	22,133	U
West Los Angeles College	1.1	49.6	6.2	4.7	34.7	7,857	U
Los Rios Com. College-American River	2.7	6.3	1.6	3.9	85.5	18,640	S
Los Rios Com. College-Sacramento City	2.3	17.1	9.2	11.6	58.0	12,202	U
Merced College	1.3	11.7	1.2	14.5	70.0	6,163	R
Monterey Peninsula College	0.6	15.2	5.4	3.9	73.0	6,516	R
Mt. San Antonio College	0.9	8.9	1.8	20.1	68.2	16,285	S

(continued)

Appendix B (continued)

Institution	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total Enrollment	Location**
Nairobi College	0.0	96.3	0.0	3.7	0.0	135	U
Pasadena City College	0.5	15.7	4.9	10.1	66.6	16,393	U
Peralta Com. College-College of Alameda	1.3	45.8	7.3	5.7	39.5	5,723	U
Peralta Com. College-Laney	1.1	53.0	5.9	5.5	32.7	9,049	U
Peralta Com. College-Merritt	1.1	39.9	6.5	4.8	47.0	6,511	U
Rio Hondo College	2.2	0.9	2.0	33.8	61.1	8,717	-
Riverside City College	1.5	9.5	4.3	7.9	71.4	11,716	U
San Bernardino Valley College	0.9	12.5	0.8	15.4	69.9	12,240	U
San Diego Com. College-City College	0.9	24.7	4.2	11.1	58.9	6,803	U
San Diego Com. College-Evening College	0.6	15.7	4.3	7.9	71.4	11,717	U
City College of San Francisco	0.9	14.6	20.1	14.9	47.5	23,030	U
San Joaquin Delta College	1.7	7.7	6.5	12.8	70.8	12,797	U
San Jose City College	1.0	2.9	3.0	11.6	80.8	13,734	U
San Mateo Com. College-Skyline College	0.8	8.8	8.6	12.7	66.2	5,675	S
Santa Ana College	1.2	5.6	1.6	13.7	78.0	13,308	U
Santa Barbara City College	3.6	2.6	1.9	10.6	80.2	6,151	U
Santa Monica College	0.7	7.5	6.3	6.8	78.7	13,774	U
Southwestern College	0.8	4.7	6.7	18.6	65.4	10,722	S
State Central Com. College-Fresno City	1.0	7.4	2.8	20.3	68.1	13,559	U
Ventura County Com. College-Oxnard	1.4	10.1	5.7	20.4	62.3	4,170	S
Ventura County Com. College-Ventura	1.0	3.5	3.5	15.7	76.2	10,383	U
West Valley College	2.5	1.2	4.1	2.4	89.3	17,641	S
Colorado							
Aims Community College	0.5	0.5	0.6	14.8	83.5	3,398	S
Community College of Denver-Auroria	2.2	22.1	0.6	16.7	51.3	3,547	U
Community College of Denver-North Campus	1.2	6.1	0.9	14.1	77.1	3,988	U
Delaware							
Delaware Tech. and Com. Col.-Wilmington	0.0	40.4	7.1	6.3	42.8	1,176	U
Florida							
Miami Dade Community College	0.6	18.5	0.5	26.2	50.6	35,368	S
Georgia							
Atlanta Junior College	0.0	92.9	0.3	0.2	5.0	1,192	U
DeKalb Community College	0.2	17.0	0.2	0.5	81.4	8,423	S
Hawaii							
Honoluiu Community College	0.3	1.5	74.5	3.2	17.3	4,075	U
Kapiolani Community College	0.1	0.6	82.2	1.9	13.1	4,356	U
Kauai Community College	0.4	0.0	62.2	10.7	24.0	820	S
Leeward Community College	0.2	1.9	70.4	3.1	21.4	6,010	S
Maui Community College	0.2	0.0	59.6	10.1	26.4	1,333	S
Windward Community College	0.6	1.2	42.3	4.6	47.1	980	S
Illinois							
Central YMCA Community College	0.6	61.7	2.6	9.0	18.3	4,991	U
Kennedy-King	0.3	97.4	0.1	0.3	0.6	8,860	U
Loop College	0.6	58.6	1.8	7.0	31.5	9,246	U
Malcolm X College	0.3	83.6	0.8	4.3	11.0	4,618	U
Olive-Harvey	0.5	94.7	0.0	1.1	1.9	4,641	U
Truman College	1.5	16.4	0.0	13.6	49.8	3,676	U

(continued)

Appendix B (continued)

Institution	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total Enrollment	Location**
Kansas							
Donelly College	0.0	54.7	9.3	4.9	31.1	486	U
Haskell Indian Junior College	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,014	S
Kentucky							
Alice Lloyd College	90.1	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	172	R
Louisiana							
Delgado College	0.2	37.2	1.1	2.0	56.1	9,326	U
Southern University-Shreveport*	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	974	U
Maryland							
Bay College of Maryland	0.0	95.1	0.0	0.0	1.7	1,011	U
Community College of Baltimore	0.1	79.7	0.3	0.2	18.3	9,049	U
Massachusetts							
Roxbury	0.2	67.7	0.0	20.5	0.4	561	U
Michigan							
Highland Park Community College	0.0	97.0	0.1	0.2	2.4	3,095	U
Lewis College of Business	0.0	98.2	0.4	0.0	1.3	225	U
Wayne County Community College	1.8	77.4	0.3	0.7	19.4	11,221	U
Mississippi							
Coahoma Junior College*	0.0	94.2	0.0	0.0	5.8	1,446	R
Ministerial Institute and College	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	297	R
Prentiss Normal-Industrial Institute*	0.0	98.6	0.0	0.0	1.4	139	R
Utica Junior College*	0.0	99.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	994	R
Mary Holmes College*	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	619	R
Missouri							
St. Louis Community Col.-Forest Park	0.3	62.2	0.4	0.4	36.4	6,074	U
New Jersey							
Essex County College	0.3	67.7	0.7	12.9	18.5	6,862	U
Passaic County Community College	0.1	48.5	0.9	19.2	31.1	1,262	U
New Mexico							
New Mexico State University-Grants Branch	14.4	0.6	0.0	43.7	41.4	174	R
University of New Mexico-Gallup	60.7	1.2	0.7	10.7	26.6	402	R
New York							
City Univ. of New York-Manhattan Com. Col.	1.4	49.2	4.2	27.8	15.8	7,800	U
Bronx Community College	1.1	49.1	2.4	32.9	13.5	9,649	U
Hostos Community College	1.2	22.2	0.6	72.2	2.9	2,562	U
La Guardia Community College	4.7	35.4	1.7	22.3	35.8	3,512	U
New York City Community College	1.3	46.0	5.2	18.0	28.3	13,833	U
Collegiate Institute	0.0	61.1	2.2	14.6	11.1	266	U
Institute of Design and Construction	0.0	32.4	7.2	9.9	47.7	111	U
Taylor Business Institute	0.0	67.9	2.0	15.9	10.5	535	U
North Carolina							
Durham Technical Institute	0.5	48.3	0.6	0.1	50.1	2,014	U
Edgecomb Technical Institute	0.0	46.4	0.0	0.0	53.6	793	R
Martin Community College	0.3	41.0	0.0	0.0	58.7	608	R
Pamlico Technical Institute	0.0	44.4	0.0	0.0	55.6	135	R
Piedmont Technical Institute	0.3	43.0	0.0	0.3	56.5	781	R
Roanoke-Chowan Technical Institute	0.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	41.0	615	R

(continued)

Appendix B (continued)

Institution	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Total Enrollment	Location**
Ohio							
Cuyahoga Com. College-Metro Campus	0.5	60.2	1.4	1.5	36.0	11,619	U
Cuyahoga Com. College-Eastern Campus	0.2	37.1	0.4	0.4	61.8	4,669	S
Oklahoma							
Bacone College	57.1	11.7	0.3	0.2	30.4	573	S
Pennsylvania							
Community College of Philadelphia	0.4	59.8	1.5	5.0	33.0	10,874	U
South Carolina							
Beaufort Technical Education Center	0.1	55.0	0.0	0.5	44.2	848	R
Friendship Junior College*	0.5	80.7	0.0	0.5	4.2	192	U
Orangebury-Calhoun Technical College	0.1	46.4	0.0	0.1	53.3	1,369	R
Trident Technical College-Palmer	0.1	66.8	0.1	0.0	33.1	1,706	U
Trident Technical College-North	0.1	46.3	0.1	0.1	53.4	3,075	S
Clinton Junior College*	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	208	R
Tennessee							
Shelby State Community College	0.1	76.3	0.2	0.1	22.1	4,159	U
Morristown College*	0.0	98.3	0.6	1.1	0.0	173	S
Texas							
Dallas County Com. College El Centro	0.5	43.1	0.1	7.2	41.8	7,233	U
Delmar College	0.2	3.3	0.4	45.1	50.6	7,104	U
El Paso Community College	0.9	6.1	1.1	55.1	36.4	8,741	U
Bee County College	0.0	2.8	0.1	47.1	48.5	2,218	R
Houston Community College	1.5	39.0	2.3	8.3	47.5	6,083	U
Laredo Junior College	0.1	0.2	0.0	88.3	8.9	2,751	U
San Antonio College	0.5	5.9	1.1	39.4	49.9	17,466	U
Southwest Texas Junior College	0.0	0.4	0.0	63.2	35.4	2,035	R
Texas Southmost College	0.2	0.2	0.5	69.2	19.9	3,446	S
Texas State Technical-Rio Grande	0.0	0.2	0.0	87.2	12.2	981	U
Southwestern Christian College*	0.0	93.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	341	S
Virginia							
J.S. Reynolds Community College	0.2	41.3	0.2	0.2	57.3	3,723	U
Paul D. Camp Community College	0.1	54.6	0.1	0.0	45.1	734	R
Southside Virginia Community College	0.0	44.0	0.1	0.1	55.7	847	R

* Historically Black two-year institutions.
** U=Urban; R=Rural; S=Suburban.

Source: OCR unpublished Racial/Ethnic Enrollment data, 1976. ISEP staff calculations.

Appendix C. Urban Two-Year Racial/Ethnic Enrollments, 1976-77 (N=83)

State	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Total Minority Enrollment
ARIZONA					
Central Arizona College	400	149	5	890	1,444
Maricopa Technical Com. College	180	692	34	957	1,863
Phoenix College	272	531	123	1,294	2,220
Pima Community College	344	719	109	2,846	4,018
CALIFORNIA					
Allan Hancock College	105	524	232	725	1,586
Bakersfield College	189	710	244	1,630	2,773
Cerritos College	162	474	237	1,932	2,805
Chabot College	201	1,079	915	1,354	3,549
Orange Coast College	166	75	362	543	1,146
Compton Community College	12	5,168	78	229	5,487
El Camino College	398	3,841	1,593	1,593	7,425
Glendale Community College	65	32	259	679	1,035
Hartnell College	139	237	543	1,161	2,080
Long Beach City College	373	3,044	1,336	2,050	6,803
East LA College	194	1,092	1,550	10,709	13,545
LA City College	320	8,350	2,876	3,046	14,592
LA Harbor College	234	1,537	1,203	1,637	4,611
LA Southwest College	17	5,149	45	22	5,233
LA Trade and Technical College	304	7,645	1,397	3,330	12,676
LA Valley College	575	996	841	2,368	4,780
West Los Angeles College	86	3,897	487	369	4,839
Sacramento City College	280	2,086	1,122	1,415	4,903
Nairobi College	0	130	0	5	135
Pasadena City College	82	2,574	803	1,656	5,115
College of Alameda	74	2,621	418	326	3,439
Laney College	100	4,796	533	498	5,927
Merritt College	72	2,598	423	313	3,406
Riverside City College	176	1,113	504	926	2,719
San Bernardino Valley College	110	1,530	98	1,885	3,623
San Diego Com. College-City	61	1,680	286	755	2,782
San Diego Com. College-Evening	70	1,840	504	926	3,340
Com. College of San Francisco	207	3,362	4,629	3,431	11,629
San Joaquin Delta College	218	985	832	1,638	3,673
San Jose City College	137	398	412	1,593	2,540
Santa Ana College	160	745	213	1,823	2,941
Santa Barbara City College	221	160	117	652	1,150
Santa Monica College	96	1,033	868	937	2,934
State Central Com.Col./Fresno City	136	1,006	380	2,752	4,274
Ventura College	104	363	363	1,630	2,460
COLORADO					
Com. College of Denver-Auraria	78	783	21	592	1,474
Com. Col. of Denver-North Campus	48	243	36	562	889
DELAWARE					
Delaware Tech. Com. Col.-Wilming.	0	475	83	74	632
FLORIDA					
Miami Dade Community College**	212	6,543	177	9,266	16,198
GEORGIA					
Atlanta Junior College	0	1,107	3	2	1,112
HAWAII					
Honolulu Community College	12	61	3,036	130	3,239
Kapiolani Community College	4	26	3,580	82	3,692
ILLINOIS					
Central YMCA Com. College	30	3,079	130	449	3,688
Kennedy-King College	27	8,630	9	27	8,693
Loop College	55	5,418	166	647	6,286
Malcolm X College	14	3,861	37	199	4,111
Olive Harvey College	23	4,395	0	51	4,469
Truman College	55	603	0	500	1,158

(continued)

Appendix C. (continued)

State	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Total Minority Enrollment
KANSAS					
Donelly College	0	266	45	24	335
LOUISIANA					
Delgado College	19	3,469	103	187	3,778
MARYLAND					
Bay College	0	961	0	17	978
Community College of Baltimore	9	7,212	27	18	7,266
MASSACHUSETTS					
Roxbury	1	380	0	115	496
MICHIGAN					
Highland Park	0	3,002	3	6	3,011
Lewis College of Business	0	221	1	0	222
Wayne County Community College	202	8,685	34	79	9,000
MISSOURI					
St. Louis Com. College-Forest Park	18	3,778	24	24	3,844
NEW JERSEY					
Essex County Community College	21	4,646	48	885	5,600
Passaic County Community College	1	612	11	242	866
NEW YORK					
Manhattan Community College	109	3,838	14	2,168	6,129
Bronx Community College	106	4,738	232	3,175	8,251
Hostos Community College	31	569	15	1,850	2,465
La Guardia Community College	165	1,243	60	783	2,251
New York City Community College	180	6,363	719	2,490	9,752
Collegiate Institute	0	163	6	39	208
Institute of Design and Construction	0	36	8	11	55
Taylor Business Institute	0	644	19	151	814
NORTH CAROLINA					
Durham Technical Institute	10	973	12	2	997
OHIO					
Cuyahoga Com. Col.-Metro Campus	58	6,995	163	174	7,390
PENNSYLVANIA					
Com. College of Philadelphia	43	6,503	163	544	7,253
SOUTH CAROLINA					
Trident Technical College-Palmer	2	1,140	2	0	1,144
TENNESSEE					
Shelby State Community College	4	3,173	8	4	3,189
TEXAS					
El Centro College	36	3,117	7	512	3,672
Delmar College	14	234	28	3,204	3,480
El Paso Community College	79	533	96	4,816	5,524
San Antonio College	87	1,030	192	6,882	8,191
Houston Community College	91	2,372	140	505	3,108
Texas State Technical-Rio Grande	0	2	0	855	857
VIRGINIA					
J.S. Reynolds Community College	7	1,538	7	7	1,559
Urban Total	**8,891**	**188,621**	**36,439**	**104,875**	**338,826**
Total Two-Year	**41,244**	**429,723**	**80,418**	**242,009**	**793,394**
Percent of Total Two-Year	**21%**	**43%**++	**45%**	**43%**	**42%**

++ Urban HBI Black two-year enrollment (4,341) increases total to 45%.

** Miami Dade's central office is located in a suburb; however, its main campuses are urban. ISEP conversation with Miami-Dade Community College staff, July, 1978.

Source: (OCR, 1978) preliminary enrollment figures. AACJC location indicators, unpublished data. ISEP staff calculations.

Appendix D. Historically Black Two-Year Institutions – Black Enrollment

	Percent Black	Black Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Locale
Lawson St. College	98.8	1,315	1,331	U
Lomax-Hannon Junior College	99.2	125	126	R
S.D. Bishop St. Junior College	88.0	1,340	1,523	U
Alabama Lutheran	94.9	130	137	U
Shorter College	95.0	189	199	U
Southern University-Shreveport	99.9	973	974	U
Coahoma Junior College	94.2	1,362	1,446	R
Prentiss Normal Industrial Institute	98.6	137	139	R
Utica Junior College	99.6	990	994	R
Mary Holmes College	100.0	619	619	R
Friendship Junior College	80.7	155	192	U
Clinton Junior College	100.0	208	208	R
Morristown College	98.3	173	176	S
Virginia College	98.8	239	242	U
Southwestern Christian College	93.0	371	341	S
Total	**95.93**	**8,326**	**8,647**	

Percent of total two-year Black enrollment in historically Black two-year institutions = 1%

Source. OCR, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data 1976, prepublication release.

ISEP staff calculations.

Appendix E. Indian Colleges

	AIHEC Membership[a]	Indian Colleges in U.S.[b]	AACTE[c]	AIHEC Testimony[d]	AIPRC[e]
American Indian Community College, Winnebago, Nebraska		●			
American Indian Satellite Community College, Norfolk, Nebraska	●		●	●	●
Bacone College, Muskogee, Oklahoma		●			
Blackfeet Community College, Browning, Montana	●	●		●	
Cheyenne River Community College, Eagle Butte, South Dakota	●	●	●	●	●
College of Ganado, Ganado, Arizona		●			
Dull Knife Memorial College, Lame Deer, Montana	●				
Flaming Rainbow University, Stilwell, Oklahoma		●			
Flathead Community College, Kalispell, Montana		●			
Fort Berthold College Center, New Town, North Dakota	●	●	●	●	●
Haskell Indian Junior College, Lawrence, Kansas		●			●
Hehaka Sapa College at D-Q University, Davis, California	●	●	●	●	●
Institute of American Indian Arts, Santa Fe, New Mexico		●			●
Inupiat University of Arctic, Barrow, Alaska *	●	●		●	●
Kuskokwim Community College, Bethel, Alaska		●			
Little Bighorn Community College, Crow Agency, Montana				●	
Little Hoop Community College, Fort Totten, North Dakota	●	●		●	
Lummi School of Aquaculture, Lummi Island, Washington		●			
Native American Educational Services, Chicago, Illinois		●			
Navajo Community College, Tsaile, Arizona	●	●	●	●	●
Navajo Community College Branch, Shiprock, New Mexico	●			●	●
Northwest Community College, Nome, Alaska		●			
Oglala Sioux Community College, Pine Ridge, South Dakota	●	●		●	●
Ojibwa College, Bemidji, Minnesota		●			
Salish-Kootenai Community College, Roman, Montana	●				
Sheldon Jackson College, Sitka, Alaska *				●	
Sinte Gleska College Center, Rosebud, South Dakota	●	●	●	●	●
Sisseton-Wahpeton Community College, Sisseton, South Dakota	●	●	●	●	●
Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico		●			●
Standing Rock Community College, Fort Yates, North Dakota	●	●	●	●	●
Tanana Chiefs Land Claim College, Fairbanks, Alaska		●			
Turtle Mountain Community College, Belcourt, North Dakota	●	●	●	●	●

* Inupiat University and Sheldon Jackson College are baccalaureate institutions.

[a] (AIHEC, 1978)

[b] (Chavers, 1979)

[c] (Thompson, ed., 1978, Appendix III)

[d] (Nichols, 1979)

[e] (Report on Indian Education, 1976, Table 6, Appendix M).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramowitz, Elizabeth, ed. *Proceedings From the National Invitational Conference on Racial and Ethnic Data,* Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1976.

Alfred, Richard. *Impacts of the Community and Junior College on Students.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium. Published membership information. Denver, Colorado, 1978.

Arce, Carlos H. "Minorities in Higher Education: Recent Advances and Current Problems" in Cynthia J. Smith, ed. *Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1978, 165-175.

Astin, Alexander. The Myth of Equal Access in Public Higher Education. "Paper presented at Southern Education Foundation," Atlanta, July, 1975a.

Astin, Alexander, *Preventing Students from Dropping Out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975b.

Astin, Alexander. *Four Critical Years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1977a.

Astin, Alexander. "Academic Administration: The Hard Core of Sexism in Academe." *UCLA Educator* 19 (Spring 1977b): 60-66.

Astin, H., Astin, A.; Bisconti, A, and Frankel, H. *Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student.* Washington, D.C.: Human Science Press. 1972.

Astin, Alexander; King, Margo R.; and Richardson, Gerald T. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1976.* Los Angeles: American Council on Education, University of California at Los Angeles. 1976.

Baker, Curtis and Wells, Agnes. *Associate Degrees and Other Formal Awards Below the Baccalaureate, 1974-75 Summary Data.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, National Center for Education Statistics, 1977.

Baldridge, J.; Curtis, D.; Ecker, G.; and Riley, G. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1978.

Barron, Jose (Pepe). "Chicanos in the Community College." *AAJC Journal* 42, No. 9 (1972): 23-26.

Barry, Toni, ed. *The Presidents.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

Baumgart, Neil, and Johnstone, James. "Attrition at an Australian University." *Journal of Higher Education* 58 (September/October 1977): 553-570.

Berve, Nancy. "Survey of the Structure of State Coordinating or Governing Boards and Public Institutional and Multi-Campus Governing Boards of Postsecondary Education as of January 1, 1975." *Higher Education in the States* 4, No. 10 (1975): 297-352.

Blake, Elias, Jr.; Lambert, Linda, and Martin, Joseph L. *Degrees Granted and Enrollment Trends in Historically Black Colleges: An Eight-Year Study.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, October 1974.

Boaz, Ruth. *Participation in Adult Education, Final Report 1975.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978.

Brawer, Florence B. *A Comparison of the Personality Characteristics of Community College Student Dropouts and Persisters.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1973.

Breneman, David, and Finn, Chester, eds. *Public Policy and Private Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

Brimm, Jack, and Achilles, C.M. "The Reverse Transfer Student: A Growing Factor Higher Education." *Research in Higher Education* 4, No. 4 (1976): 355-360.

Brooks, Gary D., and Avila, Jose F. "A Descriptive Profile of Junior College Presidents." *Research in Higher Education* 2, No. 2 (1974): 145-150.

Brossman, Sidney. "EOPS Means Opportunity in California." *Community and Junior College Journal* 45, No. 4 (December 1974): 13-15.

Brown, James. "Backgrounds and Characteristics of New Full-Time Community College Faculty Members." Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse on Junior Colleges, 1975. ED 112-991.

Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reece. *The Academic Marketplace.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1975.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Open-Door Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, June 1970.

"Carter Signs Labor - HEW Continuing Resolution." *Higher Education Daily* 5, No. 218 (November 11, 1977): 1.

Castro, Barry. "Hostos: Report from a Ghetto College." *Harvard Educational Review* 44, No. 2 (May 1974): 270-294.

Centra, John A. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." *Journal of Higher Education* 49, No. 2 (March/April 1978): 151-162.

Chavers, Dean. "American Indian Colleges." Unpublished paper. Muskogee, Oklahoma: Bacone College, 1979.

Chickering, Arthur. *Commuting Versus Resident Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Christoffel, Pamela, and Rice, Lois. *Federal Policy Issues and Data Needs in Postsecondary Education.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, National Center for Education Statistics, 1975.

Cohen, Arthur and Brawer, Florence. *The Two-Year College Instructor Today.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.

Cross, Patricia. *Beyond the Open Door.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1976.

Data Book on Illinois Higher Education. State of Illinois Board of Higher Education, May 1977.

Drake, Sandra. *A Study of Community and Junior College Boards of Trustees*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.

Dutton, Jeffrey. *Courses and Enrollment in Ethnic/Racial Studies*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, August 1973.

Farland, Ronnald; Rose, Clare; Nyre, Glenn; and Trent, James. *The Study of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services in California Community Colleges*. Sacramento: The Board of Governors, California Community Colleges, April, 1976.

Feldman, Kenneth, and Newcomb, Theodore. *The Impact of College on Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973.

Ferrin, Richard. *Developmental Programs in Midwestern Community Colleges*. Evanston, Illinois: College Entrance Examination Board, February 1971.

Fleming, John. *The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976.

Fleming, J. et al. *The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1978.

Garfield, Learita, and McHugh, Elizabeth. "Learning Counseling." *Journal of Higher Education* 49, No. 4 (1978): 382-392.

Gilbert, F., ed. *AACJC Directory*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

Gilli, Angelo. "Vocational Associate Degrees: Their Place in the Universities." *Community and Junior College Journal* 45, No. 5 (February 1975): 28-29; 34.

Gladieux, Lawrence E. *Distribution of Federal Student Assistance: The Enigma of the Two-Year Colleges*. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

Gleazer, Edmund J. *Project Focus: A Study of Community Colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Gomberg, Irene, and Atelsek, Frank. *Composition of College and University Governing Boards*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, August 1977.

Goodrich, Andrew; Lezotte, Lawrence; and Welch, James. "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges." *American Association of Junior College Journal* 43, No. 4 (December 1972/January 1973): 28-31.

Goodrich, Andrew. "Minorities in Community Colleges, 1973-74". Unpublished manuscript, College Park, Maryland [1977].

Grant, Mary Kathryn, and Hoeber, Daniel. *Basic Skills Programs: Are They Working?* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1978.

Halstead, D. Kent. *Statewide Planning in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Hartnett, R.T. *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Education Attitudes*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Haynes, Leonard. *A Conceptual Examination of Desegregation in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, Inc., 1978.

Hernandez, J. et al. "Census Data and the Problem of Conceptually Defining the Mexican American Population." *Social Science Quarterly* 53 (March 1973): 671-687.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. *Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University, 1976.

Jonsen, Richard. "State Policy and Independent Higher Education Project." *Higher Education in the States* 6, No. 1 (1977): 1-28.

Karabel, Jerome. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." *Harvard Educational Review* 42, No. 4 (November 1972): 521-562.

King, Joe. "The Perceptions of Black High School Students Toward Vocational and Technical Education Programs." *The Journal of Negro Education* 66, No. 4 (Fall 1977): 430-442.

Kronovet, Esther. "The Managers of Affirmative Action and Their Role in the Selection Process." Presented at the American Association for Affirmative Action National Conference in Washington, D.C., May 9, 1977.

Ladd, Everett, and Lipset, Seymour. *Professors, Unions and American Higher Education.* Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1973.

Ladd, Everett, and Lipset, Seymour. "Professors' Religious and Ethnic Backgrounds." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 22 (September 1975): 2.

Leister, Douglas V. "Identifying Institutional Clientele: Applied Metamarketing in Higher Education Administration." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (July/August 1975): 381-98.

Leister, Douglas, and MacLachlan, Douglas. "Assessing the Community College Transfer Market." *Journal of Higher Education* 47, No. 6 (November/December 1976): 661-680.

Locke, Patricia. *A Survey of College and University Programs for American Indians.* Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, January 1978.

Lombardi, John. *Black Studies in the Community College.* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph #14, 1971.

MALDEF, *Docket: Litigation Department.* San Francisco: Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, April 1978.

Malitz, Gerald. *Associate Degrees and Other Formal Awards Below the Baccalaureate: Analysis of Six-Year Trends.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, National Center for Education Statistics, 1978.

Martorana, S.V.; Toombs, William; and Breneman, David W., eds. *Graduate Education and Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development.* National Board on Graduate Education, 1975.

Middleton, Lorenzo. "NAACP Concerned Over 'Racial Isolation' in Cleveland's Community College." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (19 June 1978): 9.

Millard, Richard. "The States and Private Higher Education." *Higher Education in the States* 5, No. 1 (1975): 1-24.

Mingle, James R. "Faculty and Departmental Response to Increased Black Student Enrollment." *The Journal of Higher Education* 49, No. 3 (May/June 1978): 201-217.

"Minorities Account for 16.2 Percent of 1976 College Enrollments." *Higher Education Daily* 59 (March 27, 1978): 1-2.

Moore, W., Jr. *Against the Odds: The Disadvantaged Student in the Community College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970.

Moore, William. "The Community College Board of Trustees: A Question of Competency." *Journal of Higher Education* 44, No. 3 (March 1973): 171-190.

Moore, William. *Community College Response to the High Risk Student: A Critical Reappraisal.* Washington, D.C.: AACJC/Council of Universities and Colleges/ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1976b.

Moore, William. "Black Knight/White College." *Community and Junior College Journal* 6, No. 7 (April 1976a): 18-20, 40-43.

Moore, William, and Wagstaff, Lonnie. *Black Educators in White Colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1974.

Morales, Lilliam. "Extended Opportunity Programs and Services." Staff presentation to Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, September 30, 1977.

Morgan, Margaret. "Selecting Candidates for Over-Subscribed Programs." *Community College Review* 1, No. 2 (Fall 1977): 65-73.

Morrison, James. "The Community College and the Disadvantaged." *Research in Higher Education* 1, No. 4 (1973): 401-413.

Morrison, J.L., and Ferrante, R. "Compensatory Education in the Two-Year College." University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973.

Munoz, Daniel, and Garcia-Bahne, Betty. "A Study of the Chicano Experience in Higher Education." Report No. MN 24597-01 National Institute of Mental Health (1977).

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. *Higher Education Equity: The Crisis of Appearance Versus Reality.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, DHEW, June 1978.

National Board on Graduate Education. *Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education.* Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education, June 1976.

National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education, 1976 Edition.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, 1976.

National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education, 1977 Edition.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, 1977.

National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education, 1978 Edition.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, 1978.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics, 1976 Edition.* Washington, D.C.: DHEW, 1976.

Nelson, Susan. *Community Colleges and Their "Share" of Public Student Financial Assistance*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

Nelson, Charles A., and Turk, Frederick J. *Facts About Governing Boards, Results of a Survey*. Unpublished survey conducted by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co. for the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1971.

Nichols, Richard. "Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Hearings on Title III of the Higher Education Act." American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 29 March 1979.

Nwagbaraocha, Joel O. "Systems Analysis Approach to Academic Planning, Part II." *Research Profile, Institute for Services to Education*, 2, No. 1 (March 1974). 1974).

Office for Civil Rights. *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1974*. Washington, D.C.: DHEW, November 1976.

Office for Civil Rights. Unpublished Office for Civil Rights (DHEW) data, 1978, ISEP staff calculations.

Olivas, Michael. "Hispanic College Presidents." Unpublished paper. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, Howard University, 1978.

Olivas, Michael. *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

Pandey, R.E. "A Comparative Study of Dropouts at an Integrated University: The 16 Personality Factor Test." *Journal of Negro Education* 42 (Fall 1973): 447-451.

Parker, Garland. *Collegiate Enrollments in the U.S., 1977-78*. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1978a.

Parker, Garland. *Collegiate Enrollments in American Two-Year Institutions, 1977-78*. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1978b.

Pray, Francis C. *A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships, Suggestions for Change*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.

Reed, Rodney. *Peer-Tutoring Programs for the Academically Deficient Student in Higher Education*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1973.

Richardson, L.H. "The Commuter College Student's Problem in Synthesizing His Life in a Fragmented Developmental Setting." *Journal of the American College Health Association* 15, No. 4 (April 1956): 302-306.

Roueche, John and Roueche, Suanne. *Developmental Education, A Primer for Program Development and Evaluation*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1977.

Schlesinger, Sue. "Support and Opposition: Community College Faculty Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action." *Community Junior College Research Quarterly* 3 (1979): 111-120.

"Self-Reported Reasons for Withdrawal from Higher Education and Reentry Patterns." *Advance Statistics for Management, National Center for Education Statistics Bulletin* 24 (September 30, 1977).

Snow, Jerry. "What Works and What Doesn't in Community College Developmental Studies Programs." Mimeographed. Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin, 1977.

Stark, M. "Commuter and Residence Hall Students Compared." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 44 (1965): 277-281.

Southwest Network. *Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education*. Hayward, California: Southwest Network, 1974.

Thompson, Thomas, ed. *The Schooling of Native America*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1978.

Turner, William and Michael, John. *Traditionally Black Institutions of Higher Education: Their Identification and Selected Characteristics*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978.

Van Alstyne, Carol; Withers, Julie; Mensel, Frank; and Malott, Stephen. *Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions: Employment Patterns and Salary Comparisons*. Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association, 1977a.

Van Alstyne, Carol; Withers, Julie; and Elliott, Sharon. "Affirmative Action, The Bottom Line Tells the Tale." *Change*, 9, No. 8 (August 1977b): 39-41; 60.

Wagner, Alan P. and Rice, Lois D. "Student Financial Aid: Institutional Packaging and Family Expenditure Patterns." Washington, D.C.: College Board, 1977.

Willingham, Warren. *The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, July 1972.

Withdrawal From Institutions of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY

****Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment,** 2nd Edition, by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz

****The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery: A Historical Justification for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education,** by Dr. John Fleming

***Directory of National Sources of Data on Blacks in Higher Education,** 1976 Edition

***Proceedings from the National Invitational Conference on Racial and Ethnic Data,** edited by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz

****The Changing Mood in America: Eroding Commitment?** by Dr. Faustine C. Jones

***Higher Education's Responsibility for Advancing Equality of Opportunity and Justice,** by Dr. James E. Cheek (Occasional Paper)

****Equal Educational Opportunity: More Promise Than Progress,** 2nd Edition, by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz

****The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education,** by Dr. John E. Fleming, Gerald R. Gill, and Dr. David H. Swinton

***Proceedings of the National Invitational Conference on Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice,** edited by Dr. Cynthia J. Smith

***Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education: A Report**

***The "Measurement Mystique" Issues in Selection for Professional Schools and Employment,** Dr. Sylvia T. Johnson (Occasional Paper)

****Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education,** by Dr. Lorenzo Morris

****The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges,** by Dr. Michael A. Olivas

***Minorities in Two Year Colleges: A Report and Recommendations for Change**

****Meanness Mania: The Changed mood,** by Gerald R. Gill (Forthcoming)

*Available from the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
**Available from the Howard University Press

Institute for the Study of
Educational Policy
Howard University
2900 Van Ness Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Howard University Press
2900 Van Ness Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008